PUBLISHERS OF LAW BOOKS
PRINTERS AND BOOKBINDERS
The Carswell Company
LIMITED
145-149 ADELAIDE STREET WEST
TORONTO

ONTARIO

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

of the

2nd Session of The 23rd Legislature of The Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1950, ET SEQ.

VOL. 2

Volume 10.

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS FIRST DAY OF MARCH, A.D. ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT THREE O'CLOCK P. M.

Toronto, Ontario
Wednesday, March 1st, 1950
3.00 o'clock p.m.

/ / / / / / /
- - - - - - -

3.00 o'clock p.m.

And the House having met.

/ / / / / / /
- - - - - - -

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

CITY OF WINDSOR

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex, North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Walters, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Windsor", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, Y.M.C.A., ONTARIO AND QUEBEC

MR. A. W. DOWNER (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Blackwell, I move, seconded by Mr. Dent, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Executive Committee of the Provincial Young Men's Christian Association of Ontario and Quebec", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

POWER COMMISSION ACT

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Ant to amend the Power Commission Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) explain?

MR. CHALLIES: Mr. Speaker, the important part of this

Bill changes the fiscal year of the Commission to the 31st of December in each and every year, to correspond with the calendar year. In other words, the change is from the 31st of October to the 31st of December.

It provides for the filing of Commission's reports with the Provincial Secretary, and also the procedure in connection with rural, municipalities, with respect to street lights, to simplify what today is a rather difficult procedure.

That is about all there is to the Bill.

GAME AND FISHERIES ACT

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Game and Fisheries Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) if this is good or bad news.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Good legislation.

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, actually this is, shall we say again, to a large extent tidying up various small amendments here and there, and it can really be studied better when it is before the hon. members. There is a great deal of detail in it, and it would take too long to explain it all at this time.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Will it go to the Committee on Game and Fisheries?

MR. SCOTT (Peterborough): No.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I should

mention that the Speaker and the Speaker's dias are a little more effective through the gift of this very fine bouquet of flowers from the Welsh Players of the city of Toronto.

For the benefit of those who glory in the day of St. Patrick and the day of St. Andrew, may I say that this is a day of equal significance, St. David's day.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Being a proud descendant of St. David, I naturally am more than happy to draw the attention of the House to the gift which has been presented to us at this time.

There is one great thing about being a Welshman. We have never been defeated by the English under any condition or circumstance, and of that we are justly proud, and we still maintain our little Welsh independence.

I do want to express my appreciation to the Welsh Players for this very fine token on this day, which is that of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) and my own.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, today is the 1st of March, and is the day of commemoration of the patron saint of Wales. The Welsh men and women throughout the world will tonight gather in song to commemorate the occasion. I am very pleased with you, to pay my tribute to the great little country, and to the people who pulled more than their share in two world wars to help maintain the democratic way of life we all cherish so much.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I say in regard to the mention you have made, and also that of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) concerning St. David's

that all of us who are not connected with Wales, and St. David, except by the good reports, of good things which the Welsh have given us want to congratulate you and give you our very best wishes.

All the hon. members here want to thank you for your kindness last night.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL: Not me; I was not there; I got no invitation.

MR. FROST: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for East York (Miss MacPhail) will go out with you for dinner tonight, you might, ask her. It must be an oversight that she was not there.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): The Speaker's wife might have something to say about that.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to refer to a judgment delivered today by the Supreme Court of Canada on the question of whether the Federal parliament has jurisdiction in the matter of rent control. As a result of that condition, there will be less work for us to do this afternoon of a certain nature, because it is perfectly obvious, if the decision had gone the other way, and if the rent controls now in force had been declared invalid, we would have been faced with a situation of great difficulty, and it would have been necessary to have the matter dealt with in this House.

As it has turned out, the Supreme Court has decided that rent control regulations which are now in force are intra-vires of the Federal Parliament and of the Governor-General-in-Council. Although I have not seen the full report of the judgment, I have what I believe to be a substantial summary, which I might read, because it is very brief.....

The Court agreed the Parliament has the right to enact legislation which deals with a National emergency arising out of war. Parliament also has the right to decide the length of time necessary to eliminate such legislation after the emergency ends. The Court referred to the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1923 and 1947. The first case, known as the Fort Frances case, which arose during the First World War and concerned control of paper. The second was the Japanese reference case, which concerned the right of the Government to remove Japanese from the west coast. Chief Justice Rinfret said the exceptional conditions arising from the war are still continuing, the orderly transition from war to peace has not been completed. Parliament had to have authority to enact measures to ensure the orderly transition. He admitted rent controls were in a class with property and civil rights which normally are under Provincial jurisdiction. Parliament, however, had the right to move into these firlds during a National emergency, such as war if it was in the National interest. Parliament must also have the power to relax these measures when the emergency ends.

(page A-7 follows)

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) indicate whether he had legislation to fill in the gap ?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I never answer hypothetical questions.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that question is entirely out of order.

MR. FROST: We are always ready for anything.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honl Minister (Mr. Porter) whether he welcomes the decision or regrets it.

MR. SPEAKER : I think that is also out of order.

MR. FROST: We won our case.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister) Order No. 1.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT CORPORATION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First order, third reading of Bill No. 35, "An Act incorporate the Ontario Municipal Improvement Council," Mr. Dunbar.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR ((Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 35, "An Act to incorporate the Ontario Municipal Improvement Council."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. Frost (Prime Minister): Order No. 31, second readings.

THE MAGISTRATES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 31st Order, Second reading of Bill number 67, "An Act to amend the Magistrates Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I

move second reading of Bill number 67, "An Act to amend the Magistrates' Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST: Order number 32.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of Bill number 68, "An Act to amend the Surrogate Courts Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill number 68, "An Act to amend the Surrogate Court Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 33.

THE REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 33rd order, second reading of Bill number 69, "An Act to amend the Real Estate and Business Brokers Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill number 69, "An Act to amend the Real Estate and Business Brokers Act."

Motion agred to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: (Prime Minister); Order number 34.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second reading of Bill Number 70, "An Act to amend the School Attendance Act,"Mr. Porter.

HONL DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill number 70, "An Act to amend the School Attendance Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 35.

THE AUXILIARY CLASSES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 35th order, second reading of Bill number 71, "An Act to amend the Auxiliary Classes Act, " Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER(Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker,

I move second reading of Bill number 71, "An Act to amend the Auxiliary Classes Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) please indicate if this includes all auxiliary classes, such as speech classes for pupils with various types of speech defects, as well.

MAL PORTER: The main Bill includes all that type of people, but, as I understand it, this amendment does not specifically deal with that class of persons. There is nothing that is required in this to deal with it. It is merely a section which covers persons in that category, the sections which permit day classes in oral speech, and also lip reading for the deaf, to be established by school boards, with some limitations to pupils.

MR. DENNISON: This may be better discussed in committee of the whole House.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister); Order number 36.

THE MINING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 36th order, second reading of Bill number72, "An Act to amend the Mining Act," Mr. Gemmell.

HON. W. S: GEMMELL (Minister of Mines); Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill number 72, "An Act to amend the Mining Act,"

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): This would be a good opportunity for the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) to give us a speech on his legislation. I wouldlike him, in my case, to explain the Bill.

MR. GEMMELL: The first section of this Act is brought about in this way; in 1944 the regulation Act was brought in, and in the past year we haveopened up a new mining district in the province in Red Lake, and we are required to go through the regulation Act with regard to this section.

All miners' licenses bear a number and the letter of the office of issue, and in order to avoid that formality, without going through the regulation Act each time new offices open, it is our desire to make this purely an administrative matter.

The next section of this Act deals with the Mining Act and permits the reservation of surface areas of 200 feet in depth along lakes desired for summer resort purposes.

As you know, the Department of Lands and Forests indicates to our Department the lakes, the area around which they consider suitable for summer resort purposes. But in some cases, where these are not designated, it is not necessary to reserve 200 feet. As a matter of fact, three or four years ago I think it was 66 feet,---that was the limit---and it was extended to 200 feet, and now it is our desire to make that fit into circumstances which may be necessary, making amaximum of 200 feet, but not requiring that the complete 200 feet be reserved.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane, South): Is that retroactive?

MR. GEMMELL: No. When a patent is granted on a mining claim, which includes navigable waters, the section under the water has no patent granted, but a lease, and it our desire to make the same regulations conform to the lease, as applied to the patent for public claims, for the purpose of forfeit.

The next section of this Bill is designed to cover deep development work. Under the Mining Act, as presently constituted, only nine claims can be grouped for assessment work; in other words, a man who has nine claims can do all the work on one claim for the nine, but it has been found in many instances that where a group wanted to deep diamond drill---which would be at 3000 or 3600 or 4000 feet of underground work---they do not get any credit under this Patent Act.

We propose to extend this to 18 claims, at the discretion

of the Minister. It is designed entirely to encourage deep diamond drilling. Under the present Act, they would only get credit for 1800 feet of diamond drilling, which is very expensive. Under this Act, they will be given credit for up to 3600 feet.

The other sections of this Act permit us to grant different concessions to work which has already been done on deep diamond drilling. The reason for putting it at the discretion of the Minister is the fact that under the X-ray drill, it can only go about 200 feet, and we do not want that to be abused.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minster): 37th Order.

THE MINING TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 37th order, second reading of Bill number 75, "An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act," Mr. Gemmell.

HON. W. S. GEMMELL (Sulbury): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill number 75, "An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

(Take B follows)

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 24.

MINING TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fourth Order; second reading of Bill No. 75, "Ac Act to amend the Mining Tax Act", Mr. Gemmell.

HON. W. S. GEMMELL (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 75, "An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane, South): I wonder if the hon Minister (Mr. Gemmell) would explain the purpose of this Act. It appears to me we are continuing extending the exemptions in favour of mining corporations to the detriment of mining municipalities. We have had some very strong objections from mining municipalities in Ontario, and I feel this exemption is going contrary to the remarks advanced by the organization. We are extending the grants on operating mines and here again, we are extending them. I would like the views of the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) on that point.

MR. GEMMELL: I would say that this Act is just in conformity with what the Dominion Income Tax Act did in 1944 and which was followed through in 1947. Granting exemptions on new mines that came into production in 1944 did not affect us until 1947, and last year the Dominion Income Tax extended them over to 1952.

It is our intention to modify the Act and to go along on new mines only from 1947 to 1952. I do not think this will seriously affect the advantages which accrue to young mining municipalities under the Income Tax Act. As you know, a mine must earn at least ten thousand dollars. There is no

mining tax paid on the first ten thousand dollars. I do not think that new mines coming into production will affect the benefits under the Mining Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I move, Mr. Speaker, that you leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the whole House.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I would say, Mr. Chairman, that I advised the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) a few minutes ago we would proceed with these routine items until four or four fifteen, when we will go on with the Throne Debate. I may say to my hon. friends opposite, if there are any of these items he would like us to hold out, we will let them stand over.

Order No. 20.

AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 20, House in Committee on Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend the Agricultural Association Act", Mr. Kennedy.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Where would this money go to?

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): It belongs to the people you see here. It is their money and they have agreed to spend it on agricultural production they want themselves. It is not our money.

Section 4 agreed to.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Why not buy a bull from

Scotland.

MR. KENNEDY: Pride.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 21.

FARM PRODUCTS GRADES AND SALES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 21, House in Committee on Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend the Farm Products Grades and Sales Act".

Sections 1 to 7 agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 22.

LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 22, House in Committee on Bill No. 43, "An Act respecting Livestock and Livestock Products".

Sections 1 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 23.

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 23, House in Committee on Bill No. 44, "An Act to amend the Farm Products Marketing Act, 1946".

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey, South): Are we making any progress in the marketing of Ontario potatoes?

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): There is a Bill in a few minutes that will bring that in.

Sections 3 to 7 agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 24.

THE STALLIONS ACT, 1950

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 24, House in Committee on Bill No. 45, "The Stallions Act, 1950".

On Section 1.

MR. H. WALTERS (Bracondale): I wonder if the government has taken into consideration the situation in regard to racing in this

province. With respect to that here, I have an editorial from the Globe and Mail, dated Monday, February 13th, 1950.

"Wanted: A Racing Commission.

Ten days ago Premier Leslie Frost spoke out sharply to halt plans of the gambling interests for expansion of pari-mutuel betting through night harness racing in Toronto. The effect has been good. So good that it is expected that he will now go on to tidy up the rest of the racing mess in this province. In three months the new flat racing season will get underway. With the Legislature opening this week, there is ample time in which to bring to an end what is aptly described as the "Abortive Guerrilla Warfare" waged by the race track operators and the Ontario horsemen.

For years these groups have been in one brawl after another. At the moment an uneasy stalemate prevails which can erupt into fresh hostilities. That need not and should not be permitted to happen. In theory flat racing in Ontario is regulated and supervised (except for pari-mutuel betting) by a twelve-man board of the Incorporated Canadian Racing Associations. Seven of the members represent the licensed tracks; three the breeding industry and two the Horsemen's Benevolent Protective Association. In practice control is in the hands of one man, the president. The HBPA has challenged his domination (not always in the wisest manner), and the latest skirmish was fought over its insistence on an independent chairman for the ICRA.

The public, or the government, as its representative in all such matters, cannot be too concerned over the merits of the seemingly endless battles. What must be

concluded is th t two bodies are utterly incapable of working together in h rmony, let alone of co-operating on behalf of those high purposes which the ICRA was incorporated to sponsor and maintain. Their spats are an admission of bankruptcy in the management of their own affairs and a total lack of consideration for the public off whom they live. While it is true the feuding can only end in their own destruction, there is no reason why the public should be victimized in the process.

In the circumstances, the government's course seems clear. It can and should create an Ontario Racing Commission, with an independent judicial chairman, to replace the ICRA. Distasteful as it may be to have to intrude in the affairs of these private interests, from the public interest its duty is clear. In point of fact this has been the course for all governments where racing has become big business. New York State, New Jersey, Michigan, Illinois, California, Florida and other major United States racing centres all have st te racing commissions. Established to protect the public whose wagers maintain the sport, but representative of the various interests -- tr cks, breeders and owners -- these commissions are functioning satisfactorily.

Unquestionably they have reduced the frictions and strife and curbed the irregular practices which destroy public confidence in horse racing. Ontario cannot hope to clean up its situation by any less forthright action. Indeed, the night racing scheme should be the crowning example of how one interest or another continuously is seeking to exploit the absence

of official interest and the weaknesses of self-imposed regulations to further its own selfish objectives.

on the basis of that editorial I think that this government should take a suggestion that a racing commission should be set up. I feel that the government and the people have a stake in this sport or industry. There is a lot of money involved, and a lot of people enjoy it. If the people interested cannot run it, I think the government should step in.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. KENNEDY: That is all outside of this Bill. It has nothing to do with racing. The Minister of Agriculture has all the troubles he can stand, without racing protection.

MR. WALTERS: I have brought it to the attention of the government.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane, South): How bad has the horseracing been in Ontario for the past ten years? How many died?

MR. KENNEDY: Not so many.

MR. GRUMMETT: I think it would be considerably less. I wonder if we could get any information on that.

MR. KENNEDY: That will be there.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Section 1 to 17 agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 25, "The Weed Control Act, 1950".

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 25, Bill No. 46, "The Weed Control Act, 1950", Mr. Kennedy.

MR. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Once again it is my painful duty to bring to the attention of the House and to the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) that most

fearful problem we are confronted with in this province, namely, the problem of the ragweed.

I did that a year ago, and I am obliged to do so now again. I constitute myself as the ambassador and the pleader for the tens of thousands of tearful people during the early fall or late summer. Some hon. members have smiled, and some have laughed out loud. I assure you as one of the sufferers it is a painful experience, of crying and shedding tears during the ragweed season, and it is not a laughing matter. I was hoping that now, when we are finally getting around to a complete consideration of the Act -- by the way, perhaps we could call it the "Extermination Act" -- that we should be given some clear indication how we are going to handle this problem.

It is indeed painful to a considerable portion of our population, and it is also a costly thing. And the cost mounts when you realize the number of people who lose time from their work and who are handicapped in other ways and are unable to do their duties. More than that, and I address myself expressly to the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile), we are handicapping the attractiveness of our northern tourist business by failing to stop the spread of the weed in a northerly direction.

Not long ago, people from souther Ontario and from the United States would go into the Muskoka district hoping the ragweed would not follow. I am afraid that this evil, like all evils, is spreading and extending right up to Muskoka. I do not want this to be reported in the press. I do not want to endanger our tourist business. I do say, that if you travel in the north land you will see along the sides of the railroad tracks the flower of the ragweed as you keep on going north.

I suggest that we undertake a real war against this weed and this terrible thing that we are confronted with. This situation could be cleared up and it would benefit the individual. We could employe a number of people to carry on this war, at union rates of wages, of course, to bring this war to a victorious conclusion. It would be an unusual type of war. The only type of war that I would be in favour of, would be against sickness.

Here, I speak as a hay-fever sufferer, not only for myself. I speak and put forth the hopes of the tens of thousands of hay-fever sufferers in this province.

MR. W.L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): I am interested in what the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has said about this terrible ragweed and its possible destruction. I would suggest that he turn, not to battles, but buy a copy of the song "Don't Cry Joe".

MR. KENNEDY: I remember we were concerned with the war on ragweed two, three, four and five years ago, and I thought we were holding our own, with the new weed killers, we are gaining. I hope in the next two or three years to have a regular way to destroy it.

MR. HOUCK: Are you concerned with the job of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to keep all the highways clear of weeds?

MR. KENNEDY: Seek, and you will find; knock and the door will open.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): Do these inspectors have the support of the railroad? Do they know there is a war?

MR. KENNEDY: We have an agreement with the railroad

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

On subsection 2 of section 3.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane, South): I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) could clear up that section. Is it up to the municipality and the owners to clear up their own stretches of land?

MR. KENNEDY: The extermination of the weed depends on a lot of co-operation, and we are trying to get that co-operation. We say to these inspectors, "Go in and see the owners, and try to make an arrangement before taking any action". This situation needs full co-operation. If we can get together, we can get results. We have a sure cure for weeds now.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo, North): Would the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) explain to us what section two means? It says there, "the occupants of a property" and in the second section it mentions that if he does not fulfil his duties, some of the revenue that would come out of a consolidated fund would be withheld. Could we get an explanation?

MR. KENNEDY: When occupants do not cut the weeds at the side, someone is empowered to and if the council does not pay it comes out of a grant of the province. We have experiments going on, some twelve or fifteen farmers from a county have decided to pull their weeds, and the harvest suffered in an endeavour to get rid of the weeds.

(Take C follows)

MR. KENNEDY: Because when we had the sheep on the farms, and they were allowed to go onto the highways, we did not have the weeds. It is quite an interesting experiment.

MR. BROWN: This is withholding of the grant.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) that subsection 4 of section 5 is rather unusual. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) is taking unto himself rather wide powers there. The municipalities appoint the inspector, and yet the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is saying in this subsection that if, for some reason, he does not like the work of the inspector, he can say to the council which appointed the inspector, "He is no longer your man; I have fired him." Surely that action should emanate from the power which appointed him.

MR. KENNEDY: I am rather an easy-going man; we pay one-half of the salary, and if he does not do his duty, we feel he should be dismissed.

MR. OLIVER: Do you not think you should leave it to the local unit to say whether he is doing his duty or not?

MR. KENNEDY: This will be allright as it is. When a man is fired by the government, we will take it up. Will that be satisfactory?

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, supposing the council wants to discharge a man; do they have to get their approval?

MR. KENNEDY: I do not think so---if he is a good man--

MR. HOUCK: If he is a bad man, you would not discharge him.

MR. KENNEDY: No. This has been in the Act for 15 or 20 years and has been working all right so far. We have not the

right to fire him.

MR. T. K. FOSTER(Bruce): Mr. Chairman, does the government not employ a weed inspector, even in a county which may be too large for one man to operate in? It used to be that out in the organized municipalities they appointed an individual weed inspector, but now under the act the weed inspectr seemingly has taken over all the duties of weed inspection in that county. There are some very large counties, and I think probably the job is a little large for one man to handle.

MR. KENNEDY: He has power to appoint assistants. We realize that.

Section 5 agreed to.

On section 6.

MR. GRUMMETT: In connection with section 6, Mr. Chairman, I see that provision has been made for outlining the duties of weed inspector, where the statute labour regulations apply in unorganized territory.

In northern Ontario, as the hon. members know, there are very few organized municipalities. Part of the remaining unorganized land comes under statute labour regulations, where boards have been set up. But then there are vast areas in which no boards exist.

What provision has the department made to cover this situation, where there is no statute labour board or organized municipality?

MR. KENNEDY: We have trade oficials in the north, paid by the year, and we used them up there. We also have some machines up there to use in connection with weed poisoning. We try to do the best job we can. I think we are getting somewhere in the north, the same as here in the south.

Sections 6 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

On section 10.

MR. ROBERT THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) give us any information as to whether provision has been made for supplying individuals who have weed problems on their land with an exterminator? "24-D" I believe is the name of the weed killer. This material comes fairly expensive, and I imagine the Department of Agriculture might be able to get it much cheaper for the individuals and that might encourage them to use it more extensively.

MR. KENNEDY: We get it through our cooperatives' associations. The government does not buy any, but the cooperatives buy it, and distribute it amongst the farmers.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the word "annul" is the proper term to use in this section.

If you know the employment of a man, would he not be required to pay his salary back? Should not the word be "terminated."?

MR. KENNEDY: This is the exact wording which has been in the Act for 20 years, and we have had no trouble yet, and I believe that is probably the reason why we never noticed it.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): You never filed an inspection in all that time?

MR. KENNEDY: No.

Sections 10 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

On section 13.

MR. OLIVER: May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) how many districts the province is divided into now?

MR. KENNEDY: My recollection is seven.

MR. OLIVER: Is it proposed to increase the districts?

MR. KENNEDY: No, but it is proposed to increase the inspectors.

Section 13 agreed to.

On section 14.

MR. F. D. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, on section 14, has the government given any thought to giving any assistance to those municipalities in destroying their weeds, which have a tremendous weed growth? These would be, it seems to me, in a little different category than many of the other municipalities--

MR. KENNEDY: No.

Sections 14 and 15 agreed to.

On section 16.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering why the last clause of the sentence is there at all, in section 16. It seems to me, with the removal of a threshing machine from one farm to another, there are a number of weed seeds in it. They are bound to spread, and shake off. It seems to me that is superfluous there. In other words, I think it should end with the words "remove all seeds and other residue therefrom."

MR. KENNEDY: This has been in for many, many years. In fact, I think it was about 1920 when this first went in. I remember very well it going in many years ago, when I first came into the House, The thought was that a threshing machine, before it left your farm, for instance, should be completely cleaned, and a man should take a broom and sweep the top and everything else, so he will not carry the weeds along to the next farm.

MR. THORNBERRY: Does it apply to the seeds of discontent?

MR. OLIVER: In the third line of section 16, I notice the word "B-A-I-L-I-N-G." What is that?

MR. KENNEDY: A baler, bailing straw or bailing hay.

MR. OLIVER: Is that the way it is spelled?

MR. KENNEDY: Do not ask me. I neve got any marks for spelling.

MR. NIXON: Did the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) ever see a baler moving out on the road without any straw or hay in it?

MR. KENNEDY: I never did.

MR. NIXON: Will you check the spelling? Oh, I see we have the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) here.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sections 16 to 22 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 46 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 26.

RESTRICTED AREAS FOR SEED POTATOES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 26th order, House in Committee on Bill number 47, "An Act to provide for the establishment of Restricted Areas for Seed Potatoes," Mr. Kennedy.

On Section 1.

MR. OLIVER : Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) would, for the benefit of those of us who are not in the agricultural committee, say something about this Bill?

MR. KENNEDY: Certain potato growers in the province of Ontario feel they can make more money by banding together and planting nothing but registered seed potatoes. They can sell where they like, but only the planting of those potatoes must be registered seed.

The first place in Canada which had this was in Prince Edward Island; It started in a small manner, but was such success that it spread all over the rest of the province. Also in New Brunswick they have it in certain restricted areas.

Certain farmers in Simcoe County have asked for this, and when 80% of the potato growers sign a petition, nothing but

registered seed can be planted. They petition the township council.

MR. OLIVER: It has nothing to do with the marketing aid?

MR. KENNEDY: No. We passed that Act. I never thought of it. Do youwant to go back to it?

MR. OLIVER: No.

MR. NIXON: Did you not say that would not affect the small growers who just grow some on their own lots, for their own consumption?

MR. KENNEDY: I did say so, but I was mistaken.

MR. NIXON: That would spread the disease just as much as anything else.

MR. KENNEDY: There would not be very many small growers in that area. These would be farmers who grow large areas, and they have to use registered seed potatoes.

MR. NIXON: The ordinary hired man has a little plot of ground and raises potatoes for his own use.

MR. KENNEDY: He would do the same thing as yOur man would do, get a bag of registered seed from you, and plant them.

MR. OLIVER: The point is, does he have to?

MR. KENNEDY: The municipal council has the right to do it, if 80% sign.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I think under the section, it says "the council shall," not that they have the right. That is the interpretation that I place upon it. It is obligatory. It is not permissive.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): I am sure the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) is right. There is no room for local option there.

Sections 1 to 6 agreed to.

On section 7.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, on section 7 of the Bill: I have heard a lot in my day about "regulations" and so on, and I know that the hon. members of the government opposite are forever claiming that the farmer ought not to be told what to do, and how to do it, and so on and so forth. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) couldtell us the justification for a section like number 7, whihh restricts completely any growing.

MR. KENNEDY: This means that if 80% petition, they will have to plant only registered seed. The farmers themselves have asked for it, and I fancy before long you will find 100% behind it, because it means money for them. It made money for Prince Edward Island and for New Brunswick, and it will for these farmers. I think within five years there will bemany, mamy restricted areas in the province.

MR. PARK: I wonderif the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) will try and persuade the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) that when 80% of the personnel in a union shop ask for certification, they are making money for their employer, too.

Sections 7 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 47 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report seven Bills without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed. Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. THOMAS L. PATRICK (Middlesex, North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House beg to report seven Bills without amendments, and moves for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 19.

DEBATE ON THRONE SPEECH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 19th Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the Session, Mr. Frost.

(Page C-9 follows)

MR. CHARLES E. REA (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Also, I would like to extend my congratulations to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) on his election to that high office. I am sure we all agree that he has shown his capability of handling the position with his usual understanding and tact.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. REA: I have noticed in the past that it has been the habit of a lot of the hon. members when talking, to discuss their own ridings, which I think is correct. But, being a member from a large city like Toronto, it is rather hard to discuss just one part of the city. I could, for example, discuss this lovely old building we are in now, which happens to be in my riding, the University of Toronto, or the Royal Museum -- or perhaps I could discuss amalgamation -- or I might even discuss Sunday Sports -- and talking about Sunday Sports I do feel that the democratic expression of the people of the City of Toronto on Sunday Sports should be given some thought and consideration.

But I am going to discuss something which I think is very close to the hearts of the people of St. Patrick's riding, and as much a part of their lives as these buildings are a part of my riding: that is, Welfare.

For a moment, let me say a word or two about our Old Age and Blind Pensions. In January 1950, 84,321 people received Old Age and Blind Pensions, as compared with 58,287 in January 1943. This represents an increase of 44.67 per cent. During the session of 1949 as most

members will remember, it was announced of our intention to pay $2.50 to all pensioners. This was in keeping with the statement made by this government from time to time that we would pay our 25 per cent share of any basic pension set by the Federal Government. As a direct result of that, the Federal Government one month later raised the basic pension to $40.00 per month. During the last year I have noticed that a major re-organization has taken place to provide accelerated service to these grand old citizens. I have also noted that delays in granting pensions are being almost entirely removed.

I feel at this point that credit should be given where credit is due, and that is to the hon. Minister of Welfare, and his excellent staff.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. REA: The Provincial expenditure in Old Age Pension for the fiscal year 1949-50 will exceed $10,000,000., or triple the amount of a little over $3,500,000. for the fiscal year 1942-43.

I think it should be pointed out that the Ontario Government, besides contributing 25 per cent, pays in addition all administration costs, medical services, and certain limited medications that are available to all Old Age and Blind Pensioners from a doctor of their choice. These expenditures are a total charge on the Province of Ontario.

One might also say something about Mothers' Allowance. Mothers' Allowance aid in Ontario is second to none in all Canada in benefits allowed. Expenditures amounting to $500,000. per month are provided in their entirety by the Ontario Government. This Government now

grants a mother and child $50.00 per month, and $10.00 for each brother and sister. This compares to $42.00 per month in 1943 and $6.00 for each other child. Where additional needs are shown, each family may be eligible for an extra amount up to $10.00 monthly together with fuel allowance in the winter months.

The benefits provided under this Act are intended as an aid and do not preclude the mother from supplementing her income by obtaining part time employment, her circumstances permitting.

As another phase of welfare, I wonder whether many hon. members have gone down to see this great project known as "Regent Park Project". This is in east Toronto in an area bounded by Parliament Street, Gerrard Street East, River Street, and Dundas East. It has now completed, about 54 units, and in the next couple of months another section of 64 units will be added. The Province of Ontario contributes $1,000. for each housing unit when completed. Each one of these units is equipped with an electric refrigerator, gas stove, and heat and water are supplied. The accommodation in these new buildings is for the families whose houses were demolished or are to be demolished to provide sites for these new buildings. The rents for these apartments will be graded without regard for the space occupied, but by the ability of the family to pay. The lowest rent will be $29.00, and the maximum $85.00, including the services.

Before this was started there were approximately 765 dwelling units, and when this project is completed, there will be 1056 units. The total area is 42½ acres, and the amount of this covered by buildings prior to the start

of the project was 34.6 per cent, and after the project is completed, while there will be more dwelling units, it will only cover 21.5 per cent of the area. Previously they housed about 3,717 people, and when this project is completed, it will house over 4,800. There will be 3½ acres in the centre of each block.

I have visited several of these housing units, and talked to

the people living in them. I would like to pay tribute to the work of all concerned, and especially to Mr. Dearlove, who is the active Director on the job. It has taken a lot of understanding and ability to be able to accomplish this with the smallest amount of inconvenience for everyone concerned.

And may I once again suggest to those members who have not had a chance to see it, that they mark it down as something to be done before they leave Toronto. For this is certainly Canada's major project, and shows what can be done when three levels of government-Dominion, Provincial, and City, get together around a table.

We have all heard a lot about Government Compulsory Hospitalization plans, and I would like to discuss this matter for a few minutes. And Mr. Speaker, and hon. members--this is a subject to which I have given a great deal of study and that I know a lot about.

I feel that the Nation's future can best be protected by using every means to prevent disease, rather than providing unlimited hospitalization to treat it. The highest priority in importance should be given to research, preventive medicine, public health, and education.

I feel in our social security measures there should be some points that we as a Government, and the people as a whole, should not forget. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income, nationally, or individually. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot lift up the wage-earner by pulling down the wage-payer, and we all agree that you cannot build character by taking away men's

initiative--and you cannot help men by doing for men what they should be doing for themselves. Let us bear these truths in mind as we try to discover just how far a Government should go in Social Security.

There is first of all the basic fact that all forms of social security must be paid for--not with dollars but work. The Government could, of course, print enough money to meet all the demands for social security in which case the recipients would get inflation but no security. In the final analysis there is only one pot of gold into which any government can dip and that pot is filled by the productive efforts of the country's workers.

Since there is but one source of funds it then becomes a matter for the people to decide how these funds are to be allotted. In making this decision it is essential that the term social security be clearly understood. Pensions are one form of social security, family allowances another. National defence is also social insurance although it is often not considered in this category. Education is another phase of the same question. The child who is not equipped by the best possible education to live in a technological age is deprived of a considerable measure of security not only in his old age but throughout life.

There are many fields of social security calling for public funds. It would be unfortunate if one essential service were sacrificed for some other of lesser importance. To achieve the greatest benefit for the largest number of citizens, it is important for governments and all groups to keep the social security program in proper perspective and in balance, and to remember that the gold in the pot is not inexhaustible.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Speaker: May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Rea) a question? Is it not a fact that the hon. member (Mr. Rea) is engaged in the sale of privately-owned and operated insurance schemes?

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a fair question at all. The hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Rea) has the floor.

MR. REA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let us look at British Columbia's attempt to give hospitalization to its people.

In 1946 the cost of the British Columbia Hospital Insurance Scheme was approxiamtely $9,000,000.00. By 1949 it had jumped to nearly $15,000,000.00, and this year's estimate will bring the cost to somewhere around $17,000,000.00. These costs must be paid for through premiums collected by the government, or by government subsidy, and the deficit for last year is estimated at $4,000,000.00. All that expenditure of funds, and with what result? One of the most bitter complaints against this scheme is that people who need hospitalization cannot get into hospital. Dr. R.C. Newby, President of the Victoria Medical Association, says, and I quote: "There have been urgent cases waiting two to three months", and when asked if these complaints were true, the Hon. George S. Pearson says, "Yes, I think that is true." Compulsory hospital insurance, then, is not the answer. It does not improve the health of the people! Why? Because the cost of medical care increases because of administrative expenses, and because of the tendency of insured persons to make unnecessary and often unreasonable demands upon the medical care service.

Then where does the answer lie? Most diseases and ills

are preventable. We all take care that our children receive proper food, adequate clothing, and enough rest and recreation to insure their health. After all, health is a state of complete mental, physical, and social well-being, We do not take as good care of ourselves, it is true--we allow ourselves to become over-wrought and tired-- but we know better. We know that we can control our living to give ourselves a good chance of maintaining good health. But do all the people in our Province know that?

Now to get back to the responsibility of our Government for the mental, physical, and social well-being of its people--does not our duty lie in teaching the people to be healthy rather than in paying part of their hospital bills, provided they can get a hospital bed? I would like to see more thought and more attention given to a crusade for health.

True, medical science, and wonder drugs, have made terrific and dramatic steps towards curing many diseases. Children's health has been improved through innoculations, etc., But are the people of Ontario health-conscious enough? Statistics still show an amazing amount of absenteeism in industry and in the schools.

Also, I might mention that great strides have been made in cutting down deaths in T.B.--but we come to another side of the picture that is not so good: heart disease and cancer. The increase in the average deaths from these two is appalling. A public health magazine called "Health Facts" lays the issue squarely on the doorstep of the individual person. As mentioned before, thousands of hours are being spent by doctors, surgeons, research workers, and others, on the heart problem, and with some amazing results. But the sick person must cooperate.

If he does, says "Health Facts", life may lengthen out to the normal span. If he does not, life may snap.

Prevention is most important and consists mainly in doing what the doctor orders, but the biggest feature is in the hands of the individual's controlled living.

MR. LEAVEN (Woodbine): How many die in the meantime?

MR. REA: I would like to see an increased campaign of pupil participation in health projects. I realize a great deal is being done now, but I think more can be done. We might, forexample, use more films, slides, phonographs, radios, wall charts, etc. I think that a child must be trained in health, and when we have done all these things in the way of public effort, school instruction, and medical proficiency,we still come back to the home. It is upon the example, guidance, and understanding of parents, that a child's health depends most. The parent's responsibility is not one that can be met by expending love and affection only, but by informed good sense and the necessary action. The love which holds back a child from innoculation against disease, or from a needed operation, or from periodic medical examination is a misguided tenderness that takes no thought of end results. That is why I would like to repeat that more thought and attention could be given to a crusade for health.

(Take D Follows)

I ran into something not so long ago which I think you should know about. Across the line, they have really found how social security works. It is called: "Retire At Birth":

"Bold yet simple in concept, the scheme provides that every newborn child shall receive from the government a promissory note for $20,000. at three percent. interest, payable in 20 years. The government pays the parents the interest, amounting to $50 per child per month. Each year the government would pay $1,000 into a sinking fund to retire the note and at the age of 20, the child would receive the $20,000. With $40,000 as a sendoff a boy and girl could then marry immediately, invest the balance of their $40,000 in three percent. government bonds to provide an additional income for extras. By willing the $40,000 in equal parts to their children, they could increase the nest egg for the succeeding generation to $30,000 and so it would go.

"With the necessity of work thus eliminated for everybody, there would be an abundance of leisure to reflect on how wonderful life would be --

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): You would not need the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley).

MR. REA:

"--if only there were any goods upon which the welfare dollars could be spent."

I want now to discuss briefly the subject of Children's Aid, which, to my mind, is one of the most important things we have to look after.

Children's Aid, to my mind, is one of the most important things we have to look after. As most of the hon. members will remember, Mr. Speaker, two major amendments were passed by this legislature to provide additional funds on the part of the Province for the care of children coming under the jurisdiction of the Children's Aid Societies. Just to show what this government is now spending towards Children's Aid, in the fiscal year 1942-43, there was expended approximately $132,000. and for the fiscal year 1949-50, there is expected to be spent nearly $1,500,000. This is a little more than 10 times the amount spent in 1942 and 1943. Municipalities are now relieved of 25 per cent of the maintenance costs for children who are committed as wards.

Previously the total charges were assessed against the municipalities and to encourage Children's Aid Societies in their work the contributions from private sources are increased by 25 per cent from the Government of Ontario. And I feel that the Children's Aid Societies and others who work in this field should be heartily congratulated for the effort they have put in it.

There are 53 Children's Aid Societies serving specified areas throughout Ontario. Each is a private corporation under direct control of a Board of Directors composed of local citizens, who employ qualified personnel to administer the Children's Protection Act, the Adoption Act, and the Children of Unmarried Parents Act. And in

many communities they serve as a centre for child welfare activities. The keynote of the service rendered by the Societies is the prevention of child neglect. It is their endeavour to keep the child in his own home, and through personal advice and counselling services, bring into play community services which would be of assistance. Where it is found necessary, the Court may remove a child from its home and place it in the care of a Children's Aid Society which takes a legal status. Whenever possible the Society provides supervised foster home care with a private family. This care may be of a temporary nature or permanent if the child's home ceases to function entirely. The selection of foster homes is of paramount importance and the Societies are always seeking additional homes for children coming under their care. Twice a year each society is required to make a detailed report to the Provincial Superintendent on the welfare and progress of every child in its care.

With these and the other children that come under care, there are now approximately 20,000 children in care. And the total adoptions run a little better than 2,000 per year. So we see that a little better than ten per cent of these children are being adopted. This I feel is something that perhaps should be given some thought. I realize, of course, that perhaps the total number of children in care might not all qualify for adoption, but I am sure that more than ten per cent of them do. We are realize and understand that there must be hundreds, yes, perhaps thousands of these youngsters who, while they may not know it, need the love and care of a private home and the protection of a name.

Iam also sure, in this great Province of Ontario there must bethousands of homes in which the love and care of a child would do wonders for that home. And Iam just wondering whether or not our rules and regulations for adoption may be a little too stringent or strict. I realize of course that care and certain investigations must be made, but I would like to advance this thought: that perhaps these may be reviewed and stream-lined with the idea of more of these children being adopted into families who can give these children the love and affection and legal security necessary to be better citizens for our country.

I would like now to make a public appeal to all people who are thinking of adopting a loved one into their home - to contact their local Children's Aid Society, and discuss the matter with them in confidence.

May I at this point pay tribute to the great work being done for the Crippled Children by many societies, and I would like especially to mention the Variety Village which is now in operation in the Eastern part of the City of Toronto. The land for this was donated by the Province of Ontario, and the building was built through the generosity of the Variety Club and its friends - a great organization composed of those people in the entertainment field. I would like also to point out to the members that they should visit this Variety Village, which is under the capable direction of Mr. Reg. Hopper.

I would like to mention the speech that the Premier of Ontario made at Niagara Falls on January 28. In my opinion this was one of the soundest and most realistic, down-to-earth

speeches I have heard. I am sure that if a lot more people would get together around a table to try and find a solution to the many problems that are at hand and come up day by day in every level of Government, a great deal more could be accomplished in a shorter space of time than by a lot of pointless speech-making.

Thank you.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Page D-6 Follows)

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Speaker, in the beginning, I think I will not congratulate the mover and seconder, since I did not hear them, and anyway I have always had a feeling of sympathy for the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne, because they must praise the Government, that is why they are put up there, and it is always the hon. members from the last two successful by-elections who are chosen, and in this case, that traditional way of selecting the mover and seconder was followed.

I did not hear them, and so I cannot say anything about their speeches. I am sure they did a good job, with not too good material.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Oh, now.

MISS MACPHAIL: I do want to say, however, that all the speeches I have heard so far I have enjoyed -- I mean parts of them -- parts of every speech I have heard in this Session, and I am talking now about the speeches in reply. I think they were quite good, and some of them were really excellent. First, however, I want to say one or two things which occurred to me just as I was sitting there. This is a preamble, and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), Mr. Speaker, can blame himself for this, because he has been introducing this idea of preamble, only I am giving my own preamble.

It is this, Mr. Speaker, that I was sorry you could not be Minister of Education, because we need you in that position. And then I did not want to lose you as Speaker, and since there is just one of you, nothing more could be

done. But I do think we are very lucky to have the Speaker we have, and so I congratulate ourselves again upon that.

SOME hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: For sometime I have thought that education is a very important subject,and should have a Minister who devotes his time and talents to that subject solely. Apparently the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was in difficulty, he wanted our present Speaker to be Minister of Education, I understand, and he could not manage that, and then I began to look over the benches to see who he could have had. What I think he should have done really -- and I offer this in a very kindly spirit -- was to select the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Foote).

MR. J. W. FOOTE (Durham): Good for you.

MISS MACPHAIL: He has the ability and character, and that is a very necessary thing in the Minister of Education.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN hon. MEMBER: And the weight.

MISS MACPHAIL: At least, I mean, the present hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) had not enough to do two portfolios. I think at this time the Minister of Education ought not to be something else, the Premier or the Attorney-General -- both of them are very heavy jobs, and being Minister of Education is a job, and I think one person should have that job, and not another heavy one as well.

I want to be so complimentary to the Government for a moment or two that I am just going to sound like the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). I do not look like him, I am sorry about that too, but I am going to sound like him.

I am going to offer fullsome praise, first, to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) and through you, Mr. Speaker, to the whole Government for the Opposition lounge which really is worthy of being the Opposition lounge.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: We have three offices and two desks in each office, and filing cabinets for all the hon. members of the Opposition -- or, at least, a drawer in a filing cabinet -- and the place has been redecorated and we even have fern in fernpots on the mantel. Ontario's finances must be good. They must have improved marvelously. However, I do appreciate it tremendously, and the Opposition as a whole appreciate it very much, and we offer the warmest thanks to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: The other thing I am going to be very cheerful about was the trip up north. I enjoyed it, and I want to say thanks to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott). He was delightful to us. Sometimes in the House he looks gloomy and sad and bored, but on the trip north, he was alert and alive and interested every moment of the time. And, Mr. Speaker, we found that to know the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) is to like him very much indeed.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: I want to say also about that trip, a thing that surprised me was that the Opposition was as important to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) as hon. members of the Government Party.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: Share and share alike. And the hospitality of the north was remarkable. I think some people overindulged and came back heavier than they left, but the people of the north were charming, they were delightful.

Another thing we found, however, was just like the chorus of a song, the thing they talked about was roads, and more roads and more roads, and I was wishing we had had the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) along. He would probably not have been as debonair as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) -- we did not have him along, but he was charming while we had him. But the people needed the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) very much, what they needed was roads, and when I think of what the northern people are going to think of this four-lane highway promised sometime in the future to extend from Windsor and Montreal, they are not going to feel very happy.

The north shore of Lake Superior is delightful, and some day there is going to be a road around it. When, I do not know, but why not now? Can only Americans do the wonderful things that are done in our country, or can we do them sometimes?

We visited the pulp and paper company, the Kimberley and Clark Company at Terrace Bay, and we found there a very beautiful, modern hotel, so modern, so beautiful that it makes even some of the fine hotels look very archaic and out of date indeed. And yet the highway only goes four or five miles, if it goes that far, past that hotel. I think we can say that hotel is not going to be a paying venture.

Can we not have a highway that allows people to come in at Duluth and go around the north shore and go out at Sault Ste. Marie, if they want to go just that far, and continue a road which people would enjoy driving over -- there is some sort of road, but people do not enjoy driving over it, from Sault Ste. Marie to Sudbury and on to North Bay, and then connect with roads that come down here?

I do not think it is fair that northern Ontario -- and I do not live in northern Ontario -- I do not think it is fair and I felt this about the only group we met in the north, that people in the north are contributing great wealth to Ontario -- and he knows it --, but they are not getting the roads or the hospitals or the things that they need. Of course, I did hear yesterday they are getting mental hospitals. Probably it is the north that needs them much more than we do in the south.

I do feel that as Canadians, not only in Ontario, but all Canada, that we are very slow at developing the resources we have.

The thing about the north -- and then I am finished with the subject -- that made me sad, was the amount of Americans who were running industries that were developing our resources for them. At one place where we were treated beautifully in the Staff House -- it was elegant, Mr. Speaker-- we were received by an American. Now, I think he was a nice person, and I like Americans personally, but I suffered personal humiliation that legislators from Ontario as a group were received by an American president and that he had more to say about entertaining us and about informing us than a Canadian or a person who lives in Ontario had.

Then we heard that very interesting story about Steep Rock yesterday. If even one half of that is true, there is something fearfully wrong.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Oh, it is all true.

MISS MACPHAIL: Oh, I am sure it is, but I say if even half of it were true, there is something fearfully wrong with this Legislature. We should not let these things happen. Why do we let pulp and paper, the gold mines, and now Steep Rock, all be developed by American capital to make richer still already rich financiers on the other side of the line? And that does not mean I do not like Americans, that I do not think they are a friendly neighbour, but if a friendly neighbour who lives on the same street or in the same township as any one of us does comes in and starts to take the best of our resources home, our friendship would not go quite that far.

I think we have overdone it, and I do think it is one of the things that must soon be stopped. It is true that we let them take the pulpwood over for too long a time, and so they did not build any mills on this side. Well, we got around to that at last, and now the pulp is made on the Canadian side, and even some of the paper, but it is only a beginning, and there is no reason on earth why steel could not be made out of the iron at Steep Rock, on the Canadian side, or the pipelines, coming from the West, could not end in Ontario. It is a thing that I think just ought not to be, and an increasing number of Canadians, I am sure, feel the same way.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be able to be so kind from now on as I would like to be to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and may I say I have very warm personal

feelings for the Prime Minister. I used to think when I heard him speak other places, that he had a delightful, "folksy" way of speaking, but now I think it is a little oily.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): That is the pipeline.

MISS MACPHAIL: And until he made the speech the other day in the House, I was going to entreat him to sort of save us. Perhaps you are the Jonah. In this case he would be the whale -- no, no, the other way -- Toronto would be the whale and you would be the Jonah.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: I want now to say a little about amalgamation, not much, but in York East, the great riding which I represent, the biggest in Ontario, and I believe the biggest in Canada as far as population goes, for the hundreds who might be in favour of amalgamation, there are thousands who are not, and they feel that they are being pushed around, and that they have not been consulted, and they feel this "you will do it or else" is contrary to the whole conception of democracy.

I think we all want a solution to the problem, I think we all realize there must be highways going downtown to get people back and forth much more rapidly than they do at the moment, but I do feel, and my constituency certainly feel and so I speak for them, that the thing has been done in a most undemocratic manner, and what I cannot understand is, where is the hurry? Why, if we are going to have amalgamation or annexation, did we not start an awfully long

time ago, before there got to be, is it twelve great --

AN hon. MEMBER: Thirteen.

MISS MACPHAIL: Thirteen areas around Toronto? It seems to be now what one might call indigestion -- I suppose you would call it "municipal indigestion". Why could they not start it a long time ago? There were places like North York and East York Townships which were in financial difficulty in the thirties, and they wanted very much to join Toronto, but at that time, Toronto would have nothing to do with them, and you cannot wonder that these people are now saying: "Well, we have pulled ourselves up by our own effort, we have developed a local spirit", and they are friendly places. You take Leaside, it is a beautiful town, and everybody who lives in Leaside is very proud of it, they sort of think they are coming down in the social scale by joining Toronto.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: I do not agree that is true, but still, that is the way they feel about it. I do think when committees were appointed, for instance this committee, the Civic Advisory Council of Toronto, a committee to study metropolitan problems, which has been studying for two years -- well, that is not quite as long as the Hope Commission, but it is quite a spell -- I heard the chairman of that body say that now they are going to bring down recommendations within a month or six weeks. Well, if we waited 25 years, what is six weeks? It is not my personal opinion we should not try to solve the metropolitan area's problems, I do not think it is that of anybody, it is that we should not try to have, for instance, a board of five,

a Municipal Board, that is not democratically elected, just say: "You are going to amalgamate, and that is that". If we cannot be any more democratic than bringing it to the Legislature, at least we should be as democratic as that. What were we elected for? We were elected to represent these different areas. Now they feel they are in deep trouble, and so, personally, it would be a difficult decision, I know that there is a fine argument on both sides, but I do think that some more democratic way than having a board of five -- an appointed board not elected, just appointed -- could be found.

I judge from what I heard, and twice I have gone around the city hearing everybody I could on this subject, another thing that seemed to me to be wrong was that there was no plan offered, nothing about what they would get in exchange for what they gave, and if this was going to come down this year and be such a tremendous problem, why under heaven did we have one of the most beautiful municipal buildings I have seen in a long, long time, built in East York last year, and in Leaside last year, and a great municipal building bought by Scarborough from the Geco -- General Engineering Company -- last year? I mean, if there is such a sudden need now, why did it not come last year? At least those three buildings would not have needed to go up in that case.

Well, I do not know the answers. This is the Government's baby, and by Jove, it is going to be a squalling infant.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I know the answer. I will tell you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, yes.

MR. L. S. SLASMAN (St. Andrew): I know the answer. I will tell you.

[illegible] by Scarborough from the Gee -- General Engineering Company -- last year? I mean, if there is such a sudden need now, why did it not come last year? [illegible] that these buildings would not have [illegible] be found. Well, I do not know the answers. This is the Government.

[illegible]

MISS MACPHAIL: Well, I will be glad to hear it from somebody, and, being of a suspicious nature, I wondered if the hon. Treasurer of the Province of Ontario (Mr. Frost) was trying to save a lot of money on grants. It is just an idea, I do not say he is, but he will. I fancy that is why East York Township, which has a population of 55,000, is still a Township, because townships grants are much better than city grants and why they have a city in population, but have remained a township. I do not know from the township myself, but my judgment would be that the grants had something to do with it.

What the Government does with it, we will see as time goes on, but I do feel that this "you will do it or else" comes very badly from a country that fought two wars to escape the "or else" business.

The remainder of my time I want to devote to the same subject as the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Rea), but from a somewhat differrent point of view. It is a long time now since I first became interested in government of one sort or another, and in all that time, it is not the game or the fame, which is very short-lived at best -- I had a letter returned from Ottawa, I think it was yesterday, which said, "Not known here".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: But my interest has been, and is still, and will I think remain, the people, and the people least able to look out for themselves. I have never been interested in the powerful and the rich, because I think they get more than their share anyway, so I see no reason why I should bother about them.

I looked very carefully to see what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) had said on this subject, and I will give it to you, for I am not clear on what it means, and maybe the House will be able to decide it:

> "I would say that the need for direct relief which existed in the past has, to a very great extent, disappeared, and we hope under the economic system in days to come it will entirely disappear. These adjustments in these days of change and alteration, which were brought about by the aftermath of war and the economic difficulties we have been faced with in this world, I am sure that these things will be taken care of in the course of time".

AN hon. MEMBER: What time?

MISS MACPHAIL: Oh, I do not know. I do not know what time, I do not know what system, I do not know what problems. So I think we need something more than that on welfare subjects. I think that is too little.

Yesterday I greatly enjoyed hearing the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) -- oh, it was not the first time I have enjoyed hearing him speak, and I envy that beautiful voice of his, which he does not have to raise, and which resounds to the topmost gallery. It is a great gift. Yesterday I enjoyed his speech, but when he was talking about the things the Province should take over entirely and so leave the municipality free -- I think he mentioned highways and education -- the thing that I think is more important still, from the point of view of relieving the municipality, is the whole problem of welfare. I think

that should be handled at the provincial and federal levels of government. There is not much the municipality can do about it, it is too great a burden on the municipality, the people there usually have not the same personnel, they have not the same expert advice and so on, and I think he might have added that the provincial and federal governments should look after welfare entirely.

I am going to talk now about the unemployed. There are two kinds, the employable and the unemployable. The unemployable, that is those who cannot work ever again, are helped by the province. Half of the amounts they receive come from the province, and the other half from the municipality. They live in luxury and I am just going to prove it to you.

Their food allowance is the best. I was going to do it backwards, but I will not. I will start with the best and go to the worst, whereas I was going to start with the worst and go to the best and leave you in a more cheerful frame of mind, but I will do it the other way, since that is the way the pages are.

If you are unemployable, the province pays half of the cost of relief, if it does not exceed a maximum amount. There is no minimum set. This is the food allowance: first there is a weekly food allowance for a single adult of $3.68; an adult in a family, $3.04; an infant under one year, $1.65; a child from one to three, $2.35; a child from four to nine, $2.74; a child ten to twelve, $3.14; a girl thirteen to fifteen, $3.14; and a boy -- just because they are more important in the view of the relief authorities, I suppose -- thirteen to fifteen $3.49.

That must include milk and other foods. Pregnant and nursing mothers get extra milk and get cod liver oil, and children get cod liver oil, and a person who cultivates a garden gets a package of seeds.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: It is a good thing it is additional, because they certainly could not buy it out of that amount of money.

But, meagre as the food allowance is, Mr. Speaker, it represents the most generous section of the scale. For shelter, a single person is allowed $6.00 per month -- I do not know where you would get the room, but anyway there it is -- for an unfurnished room, $10.00 per month for a furnished room. A family is allowed per month $10.00 for the first room, plus $2.00 for each additional room. That is not by the week, remember, it is by the month. And that is in Toronto only. Outside Toronto, $8.00 per month for the first room, plus $2.00 for each additional room.

(Take E-1 follows)

But the best is yet to come. Clothing. The clothing allowance is one dollar per person per month. That would make it $12. a year. What could you buy with that?

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): Is that the Government scale?

MISS MACPHAIL: It do not know whose scale it is, but that is what they get. An additional sum, averaging about 35 cents per month is allowed for "household sundries". For medical care, the province pays 56 cents per month to the Ontario Medical Association, and that has to pay all the doctors' bills. It also provides for a severely limited list of medicines, but the regulations warn the doctor that he must not go pampering his patients with medical aid, appliances and supplies, or supplies of household remedies, such as absorbent cotton, adhesive plaster, boracic acid, boracic ointment, baby powder, cod liver oil, disinfectant, gauze, lime water, linament, milk of magnesia, olive oil, petroleum jelly and tincture of iodine. Presumably, these have to be paid for out of the 35 cents allowed every month for "sundries".

If you needed special home care, the province will pay half of a flat allowance of $40. a month, provided your doctor will certify that you are physically or mentally defective. If you lived on that very long, you would probably be both.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: That is the unemployable situation. Now, we come to the employables, those who can work, if they can find work to do. Oh, of course, if they live until next summer, the Government will give them work, but that is just

a chance. It certainly will not be anything this Government does.

We are now in a worse position than we were in the 30's, and anybody who lived through a Parliament or Legislature in the 30's, as I did, knows that anything worse is terrific, because what we had was the worst thing I have ever seen.

Now, the Province of Ontario does nothing at all for the unemployed employables. As was mentioned by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) yesterday, I wonder that the Globe and Mail printed the picture they did, as it does not support its general editorial policy. That is the picture of so many men -- I do not know how many, but a crowd -- sleeping on the floor without blankets. Many of those men undoubtedly were veterans of the second world war. It is true that a lot of them may not use their money wisely. We all know that is true. But there are a lot of other people who do not use their money wisely either.

When I saw that picture, and then went and saw again this line-up for the soup-kitchens, standing in the cold winds, waiting to get in, I suffered. I do not know what they were suffering, but I know I suffered.

Are we going to go through the soup-bowl, flop-house regime again? Is it to be done all over again? Have we learned nothing since the 30's?

I was speaking to two welfare workers the other day, executive people in the welfare organizations, and they said that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) at Ottawa had assured them this was just a seasonal unemployment. Well, Mr. Speaker, that does not make the boards any easier to lie on; that does not make them any warmer without a blanket.

The difficulty is that we do not think about them as if they were ourselves. There are a lot of fine-looking men in this House, none of them finer-looking nor more debonair than the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), but he would not remain that way if he had to lie on a floor and cover himself with an overcoat -- if he had one.

The thing that happens is that you break the spirit of these people. They become so unkempt-looking that they cannot get a job anywhere, even if they had a new suit of clothes or visited a barber. When you get down far enough you just cannot get a job. Nobody wants a man who looks like a tramp to work for them. I do not know of any words of mine that will move a Government, which is not moved by such conditions as are appearing in the papers day after day.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: The Federal Government talks a lot about the "shelf of public works", which it has. Well, it must be a high shelf, because they do not seem to be able to get any of them down. It is all right to say, "We will do wonders next summer". Well, of course, next summer the sun will be shining and it will be warm, and it would not matter so much if they had to lie on the grass without a blanket. But what will happen now? This Government seems to have no concern about it at all.

One of the things which adds to this problem is the untrained people who go out working very early. They leave school when they are 14, on permits, and leave the school when they are 16, if they are children of mothers on allowance. They are untrained. Today, even in the

building trades, such as stonemasons and bricklayers, are almost non-existent.

I heard Mr. John Edmunson, K.C., speaking the other day to the Howard Society, and he said that one of the problems which is showing up very clearly this winter, is the number of people who do not get jobs, because they have no training.

We would be saving ourselves some expense, because, remember, if these people who are sleeping on the floor without blankets get pneumonia, we send them to the hospital and we take care of them. Once the situation gets bad, they will be housed some place.

I remember "Bill" Irvine, M.P., used to say in Ottawa, "Either we have too much Christianity or not enough. If we had enough, we would treat these people like human beings; if we had not any, we would get rid of them."

But we are doing the half-and-half thing. Why, speak about the "Brotherhood of Man". A lot of "brotherhood" we have, when people are not able to provide for themselves, and are even without the barest essentials of life.

When speaking of "training", I want to make it clear I do not mean academic education. That kind of thing can be carried too far. We have too many people now working in white-collar jobs, keeping their hands clean. It is a snobbish attitude. There is no reason we cannot have all the education we can acquire, but having a good education does not mean we cannot create with our hands, that we cannot do something.

I want to tell you a story out of my own experience, which illustrates what I mean. One day I was driving from Montreal with two professors -- very learned gentlemen, one

in the classics and the other a historian; both well-known, as are their wives, and you would recognize them if I named them. We had been down to some association for -- I do not remember what, but it was one of the things trying to make conditions a little better for many people.

We were coming back and were in Ontario when we had a blow-out. These professors got out of the car, and looked profoundly at the flat tire, and I could see we were going to have a long wait, when I saw up in a field a farmer on a tractor, and I decided he knew how to use his hands, and I walked along to him and I said: "We have two professors back there on the road, and we are really in a quandary about the flat tire", and I gave him a dollar, and I said: "Do not tell them, but will you go back and change the tire?" And he did.

The professors talked about that for miles and miles, as to how smart the young chap was, and how quickly he did it, and how casually he did it.

(Take F-1 follows)

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: We need more training of people to do things, not to just get on a line, what do you call those lines, assembly lines, not to do just one little thing on an assembly line, but to have the ability to create something or do something, it is all education. I do wish the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), when he is making all those fantastic changes in education, would get around to considering the child, where it is, the talent it has, and work on from there.

I was told at one time, when I was a school teacher, that it is a good thing to go from the known to the unknown, with the qualities that a person has, and we have a lot of people in situations which they know little about and have little ability for because their talents and their teachers and everybody was shoving them on into the academic fields for which they were not fitted. I want to stress that is not the all-important field. I get a little fed up with the academic people. They think they know everything, and they are just about the worst people you can have when you put them to a practical problem.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: When we think of the pioneers, of the second generation, the children of the pioneers and what they did, just with good practical common-sense and ability to work and drive. It is true education is a good thing, but it is true also that it can be carried far too far along the line of what the Old Country people used to call, "book learning".

I want to suggest something to the Government which they are not going to like at all, and that is the children of mothers on allowance who are being trained in a non-paying trade, should be carried on from 16 years of age to 18 years of age so they would have some ability to earn a living when they go out and try.

Persons of sixteen are not mature enough to do a good job, and go from job to job. Lew Edison said the other day, and he knows a lot about his subjects, that a good many of the difficulties of the young men who are now in the reformatories and jails of Ontario and the federal prisons in Canada is they come from the ranks of the people who have no preparation to earn their living. That is a costly business. It would not cost so much to carry them on and train them as it does to take care of them in reformatories and jails and penitentiaries. That is a costly business.

I urge the Government to consider seriously this business of keeping the children of mothers on allowance from 16 to 18, if they wish to continue to train themselves in some manner -- they may go to one kind of a school or another, technical school, agricultural school, collegiate institute, so they may have further education. It would cost the Government, as I figure it, if fifty percent. of them wanted to go on to 18, it would cost about $1,834,920. Well, I have seen the Government spend much more on much less. It is not really spending lavishly, and it will cost the Province of Ontario less than if a large proportion of these people get into trouble, and we have to take them and train them after all, and probably too late.

There is another field we have missed entirely, another group of people, and I do not quite know how it is that they

have been entirely missed, and they are the totally disabled. Of course, there are the totally disabled veterans, they are looked after, and disability because of complete blindness, and they are looked after; if they are too old to be re-trained or have not been trained, they are looked after to some extent anyway. They get the same as an old-age pensioner, which is not very much, but it is something.

I know a great many people, and I am sure we all do, people who are totally disabled that get nothing. I suppose, if they lived in the City of Toronto or some other urban centre, they are probably on the magnificent sums I was reading to you a little while ago for food, shelter and clothing, but they do not get any sum of money. The totally disabled, I think, are a class that should be considered, because they suffer terribly. They must feel they are a burden to their family, and if they were getting even the same as the blind, the same as the old-age pensioners, how much more independent they would feel, and how much less a burden to their immediate families they would feel.

I can remember in the House of Commons when we passed The Old-Age Pension Bill in 1926, we tried at that time to get the blind included. Now, that is too fast, progress does not come as fast as that; you have to wait several years and then you get it. However, it is done later. Well, I suppose it is just a matter of developing public opinion, but people who are totally disabled are not in a position to develop public opinion. They are the people that we who are active should remember, and hope we do not have to suffer as they suffer. Take arthritis alone, how many people

are totally disabled through arthritis? Well, I recommend it to the Government.

I had a friend who had quite a long illness. She was in the Wellesley Hospital, and was telling me about a woman she came to know while there. This woman had been a working woman and worked hard to make a living, not only for herself, but for her child. When she was ready to leave the hospital the doctors told her that she would never work again, that her illness was of such a serious nature that that was the end of her work. She was forty years of age. There seems to be a lot of people like that, and that brings me to the next thing I wish to talk about, and that is hospital insurance.

I want to approach it differently from the approach made by the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Rea). I was thankful for one thing, however, that he took British Columbia as an example and not Saskatchewan. Whenever you see a capitalist government doing a socialist job, they do a bad job.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: His story was just another proof of that. We have all kinds of hospital insurance, the Blue Cross, the Co-operative Health Service, many other kinds. There was the one of Jim Hunter, the Mutual Benefit, and if you could get the kind of illness that Mutual Benefit will pay you for, you are just lucky.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: We have all these kinds of things around, and they make beautiful little speeches on the radio over and over again. When Jim was broadcasting, I endured the commercials to hear him, but with John Collingwood Reid,

I feel it is too much.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MACPHAIL: The point is that we pay tremendous sums of money, and to come back to this woman, and it is a very recent case, it just happened this fall, she came out of the hospital, and her total hospital bill -- this woman who was never to work again -- was $1,400. She was an honest woman, she wanted to pay her debt, she was worried -- as she need not have been -- but she was worried. She did not see how she would ever pay it, and she wanted to pay it. After all, all we are doing is pre-paying our hospital and spreading it over the widest possible area.

I was in the hospital for a few days just before Christmas, and I was covered -- I had been with the Blue Cross for years, but I transferred to the Co-operative -- and the hospital bill amounted to nothing, although the laboratory costs were high, but it was pretty well covered. Well, that means something. I was very glad it was only a few days; it did not matter much, but if a person is in for weeks and weeks with very little money, all we want is to spread it over a large area. I think since we have not the federal government persuaded as yet, although that might come in another twenty-five years, that the province is the body that could do it. It is true, at first, hospitals will be overcrowded. Well, that will just mean some more hospitals. I think it is the best way of solving the problem. In this way everybody pays whether they are sick or well, so when they are sick, they will have paid before they are sick and they are not worried and they are apt to get better all the quicker. There is nothing very radical about it, there

is nothing frightening about it. I am just trying to console the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Roa). It will come, it is just a question of when.

I noticed in the paper this morning that somebody had passed a resolution for the same rates for Hydro all over Ontario. It must have been twenty-five years ago that the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) and I made speeches for flat-rate Hydro. Well, if you wait long enough, it comes, but sometimes it takes quite awhile.

I do think we are to the point where we want to get rid of Mutual Benefit and the Blue Cross and the Co-operative. The Co-operative, by the way, is the best because it is truly co-operative, and the farmers were driven to it because the cost of Blue Cross went up and up even though they had this "kitty" of two million dollars or one and a half million dollars. I do not know what they were doing with it; I do commend to any of you the co-operative method, it is by far the best now available. The trouble is it does not cover everything; Blue Cross does not cover everything; Mutual Benefit does not cover everything. I want a scheme to cover everybody. I do not want a poor working woman that has to go to the hospital to come out with a $1,400. bill. The men always speak about men, so you will not mind, Mr. Speaker, if I talk about women.

The last thing I want to talk about is the aged people in Canada. I am not going to ask for any more money from this Government, it would be useless. I would not get it anyway. I want to talk to the whole problem from a different point of view, because money alone will not solve the problem of the

aged. I want to give you some figures, to show you our population is rising. In 1921 -- the year I went to the House of Commons -- since 1921, citizens over 60, the proportion has risen from seven per cent of the total population to thirteen per cent and it is still rising.

There are in Ontario 363,900 persons over 60 years of age, and at some time in the 1950's, the people over 65 years of age will constitute 10.5 per cent of the total population. The problem is going to grow and we ought to have some solution before it gets any bigger than it is at the moment. I do think the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) of this government has done a very good job with the law as it is written. I do commend the work he has done. I think it is very fine.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: I am encouraged to think that if something is going to be done in other fields, there is an absence of housing. Securing jobs that old people can do, to keep them in localities in which they always lived. I do not think there is anything which causes more misery than taking an aged person, or even one that is not so very aged but is getting on that way, from where they have spent their life, to some place with which they are not familiar. It is a living death, they are not happy, they are never really interested again, and so you get early decay, physical and mental, as a result.

I think the first thing the government should address itself to, the first problem of the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) particularly, is in trying to keep the aged in the general locality in which they have lived. I think something is going to be done about this, and I hope it is

something satisfactory. Having great buildings and putting the aged people in great buildings is just no good, these large buildings with a whole lot of people, husbands and wives separated, and they are treated as though they were in prison. In Grey County -- this happens as well in other counties -- in the Grey County Home I visited a woman there from our village, a woman I knew very well. She had had pneumonia, and had not been able to look after herself. She was a pensioner and went to the County Home. I went to see her, and all the time I visited that woman, whom I had known for many years and who was a very intelligent woman, one or other of the people who were running the home walked back and forth before the open door. I resented that terribly, and I am sure the lady in question did, too.

What business was it of theirs? We were not talking about them, and even if we were, we had every right to. They even censored the mail going in and out. You would think these people were prisoners. Well, that kind of a home is not a home at all.

Place these older people in places where there are things they are interested in doing, not things they have to do. This same lady told me she had to stand so long washing dishes. She had been a hard worker and knew how to do work very well, but apparently she was given the job of washing the dishes here, and it was a very great job in an institution. While doing this work, she had to stand on a cold, stone floor. That is not very good, but there are kinds of jobs, if somehow these aged people could be kept tied up with the community, where they could help others.

This would give them a feeling they were useful, that they belonged, that life was still worth living.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: The houses of today -- I am talking now of the children of aged people, the whole trend of housing is towards smaller and smaller houses which have two bedrooms.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Or one.

MISS MACPHAIL: Yes, but there are a lot of houses with two, but there is no place at all where a mother or father or relative can live with them. I do not know that they should live with them, with the younger people, anyway. And now, in the old days it was a far happier life for the old people, because they had big houses. The pioneers had little houses; when they built houses, they built great big ones, and they could look after so many people. I remember my mother's mother had a cousin come out from Scotland, and he came on a visit and stayed a year. That was all right, there was lots of room and lots to eat. What about it? He, like the hon. Provincial Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. Frost) was a Scotsman, and was pretty careful about his money. Those were happy days for aged people, because they lived in the same houses as their descendants; they were interested in their children and their grandchildren, they saw the work going on, they even took a hand at bossing people around, and really had a good time. That is not true any more.

They are shoved out these days, because these little houses have no place for them. These days they are not useful, they are not wanted. I do not know of a sadder thing that I have seen in the City of Toronto than two daughters going to see a mother in a so-called nursing home. The mother was

then about ninety, and she was in a room with about five other people. I was visiting one of the others, and I thought, "well, if that is the end of life, it is pretty awful. To die in middle life would be very much better than that sort of thing."

They are pushed out, and placed where they cannot cause any trouble, and they can go to see them occasionally. Sometimes, of course, they forget.

There are some things in this field, however, that are encouraging. It all depends on the character of the people running old people's homes. I know of a few homes where it is well run by people who care. After all, what we need is a bit of heart in welfare work. We should look after the aged people, and take them out and try to make them still feel that they are part of a community, and particularly, that they live near where their farm or where their former home was. I suggested recently in a speech I made that the Government should do that before we get along very much further.

In thinking about aged people, and keeping them busy, I think there should be some welfare workers visit the old-age pensioners in the Province of Ontario. The case load of the investigators is too heavy, and the spirit of the people who have gone around has been to find out if it is all legal, and if they are not getting a little of the Government's money they should not have, and so on. They are not a friend and counsellor to the aged. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) would say otherwise, but there are too many people to see, and they cannot take their time about it, they are so busy saving the money of the province, they are

afraid to be generous to the aged.

One country has done a remarkable job on this, and that is Sweden. They have started a thing that is very interesting, they call it the Flower Fund. Instead of buying wreaths and filling houses with flowers when people die, and they are sorry about the death, they give an amount instead to a flower fund, and the flower fund is entirely used to build houses for the aged and take care of them and keep them happy. I will read you a little bit about it:

> "Apartments for single persons consist of one room and lighted kitchenette, with electric stove, about 20 to 30 square meters (yards) inside. For couples, there is one room and a kitchen, about 26 square meters in space. Maximum rental for single accommodation is $67.20 a year; for two or three persons, $100.80 a year."

Well now, that is something like it. It is bad enough in suburban districts, but it is worse in the big cities. They get $40.00 a month, and they have to pay up to $6.00 a week at least for their room. How are they going to pay that and eat and have any clothes to wear, even a clothes allowance of $1.00 a month? Well, that is that.

All these things should be done. All of them will be done sometime, but I do not know when. They will be done probably when the C.C.F government comes to power.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS MACPHAIL: That is true, really true. It may be awhile, but it will come some day. I have a quotation of the welfare expenditures in Canada. Welfare expenditures

in Canada are only five percent. of Canada's total production. That is not much, we could spend more than that. That total amount of money has been spent by Canadians last year for liquor and tobacco, that amounted to $941,000,000., but the total cost of welfare was $680,000,000.

Now, I think if the people did consume all that liquor, if they are still around, they would admit that welfare is more important. It is true that some people like to drink in moderation, and some people like to drink without moderation, but that is a stunning amount of money, and if we can afford the one, we can afford the other.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Take G-1 follows)

May I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that government is a modern Robin Hood. There is no other way to get the "Too much money" to the people who got the "Too little." Upto the end of 1949, you could harly pick up a paper without reading all sorts of things, such as "Their profits had doubled" or "We pay so much a share," and so on. I could give you the exact quotations, but I think youhave all read them. They had a glorious time, the big "guys" with the money.

But the "Robin Hood" who takes from the rihh to look after the poor should be the government, and I hope the government is well aware of it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. M. NEWMAN (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, it being close to six o'clock, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I file answers to certain questions, numbers 7, 2, 15, 19 and 22.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Well, that is making progress.

MR. FROST: I thought the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) was getting ready to askme when we were going to start answering questions, so I thought I would file these answers.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We are very patient.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, may I say it is our intention togo ahead with the addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne tomorrow, all afternoon, and, if possible, I would like to have one or two take part in the debate on Friday. We are very anxious to give the private hon. members of the House the opportunity of speaking, and there

is a considerable list of those who have indicated their desire to speak, and I am anxious to give them the opportunity.

MR. JOLLIFFE: A very impressive list.

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.48 o'clock p. m.

- - - - -

THIRD ERRATTA.

Volume 9, page G-2 ; 4th line.

Delete balance of paragraph after the words "6,000,000 shares of common stock", and substitute therefor:

"Thus, if the dividend had been paid, Mr. Eaton would have received twenty cents on each of 1,500,000 one-cent shares."

Line 12: After the words "led by an American financier", insert:

"The House will be astounded to learn that only last year the Ottawa government gave Steep Rock Iron Mines, $240,000.00 in the form of a subvention."

Line 13: Delete after above, balance of line and line 14, after "that is" insert.

"sufficient to maintain a $60,000,000.00 steel industry."

- - - - - - - - - - -

Volume 11.

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS SECOND DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT THREE O'CLOCK, P. M.

/ / / / / /
- - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Thursday, March 2, 1950,
3.00 o'clock, p.m.

/ / / / / /
- - - - - -

3.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Chartrand, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Incorporate the Congregation of the Priests of the Sacred Heart", and that same be now read a first time.

HON. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, what about the seconder not being present in the House?

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): I will second it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Calder, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that the Bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege.

My attention has been called to a news item in yesterday's Toronto Telegram reporting a speech made by me in this Chamber on Tuesday afternoon.

The Telegram states that certain reference I made to Mr. Cyrus Eaton and his connections with and profits derived from the Steep Rock Iron Mines were communicated to Mr. Eaton by telephone in Washington, D.C., and, according to the Telegram, drew him to comment -- "the gentleman is talking through his hat" -- the news report adds that "Mr. Eaton declined further comment".

Now, Mr. Speaker, since Mr. Eaton's remark throws

doubt on my veracity, I deem it my duty to further substantiate the statements I made insofar as they concerned Mr. Eaton as the Chairman of the Board of Directors of Steep Rock Iron Mines Limited.

First of all I stated that Mr. Eaton held 1,500,000 shares of Steep Rock stock for which he paid one cent a share. Now, I must confess that here I do appear to have been in error for according to the Canadian Mines handbook, 1949, I should have said 1,437,000 shares.

Secondly, I stated that Mr. Eaton received a commission of two per cent of the value of all ore sold at Steep Rock. Verification of that will be found on page 203 of the Canadian Mines handbook, 1949 -- and here the House may be interested to learn that the value of Steep Rock ore sold during the first ten months of 1949 amounted to $8,243,204., according to Mr. D. M. Hogarth, president of Steep Rock Iron Mines Limited, as reported in the Toronto Telegram of December 8, 1949. Thus, if we are to believe the Canadian Mines handbook, Mr. Cyrus Eaton would collect a profit of two per cent on the above figure, in other words, $160,000.

Thirdly, I stated that in the first ten months of 1949 Steep Rock Iron Mines Limited made a profit equal to twenty cents a share on its common shares -- here again I was slightly in error, for according to the Toronto Star of November 29, 1949, I should have said 19.5 cents. I may say, however, that in all cases I quite deliberately used round figures.

Finally, I stated on Tuesday last that the Ontario taxpayer is actually subsidizing the Steep Rock operations which are producing these great profits for Mr. Eaton. In

this connection it will be recalled that I mentioned specifically the Ore docks at Port Arthur, the C.N.R. Spurline from Atikokan to the lake, the ore cars and, I might add, the power plant purchase approved by legislation in this House last year -- all of this, of course, runs into many millions of dollars.

I also referred to the subvention paid by the Federal government to the C.N.R. for the movement of Steep Rock ore. This amounts to twenty cents a ton on the ore moved and, according to a statement made in the House of Commons by Transport Minister Chevrier, as reported in the Globe and Mail of December 8, 1949, reached the figure of $240,000., in that year alone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the facts I have just given are all verifiable, but I assure you and the House that I am by no means satisfied that they tell the whole story of Mr. Eaton's operations in this province and I now challenge this modern Ponzi, who dismissed my charges so airily, to invite an investigation of his operations by a committee of this Legislature. I am confident that if such an investigation were made.--

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think this is beyond the point of personal privilege.

MR. MacLEOD: I will be finished in a moment.

MR. FROST: I think the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) has a perfect right to speak on personal privilege, but I do not think he has any right to go beyond that and go into the matter of enquiries, and challenging, and whatnot. That is not personal privilege. I think if a statement the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) has made is challenged, then he has a perfect right to explain it. I think that is the situation.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I have been doing. My veracity as a member of this House has been challenged by a gentleman who does not sit in this House. I have just about completed what I have to say --

MR. FROST: Yes, you are going off on a tangent. That is always the way you do.

MR. MacLEOD: No, that is quite unfair --

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I think that the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod), in making a suggestion for an investigation, is going a little beyond the point of personal privilege. I am quite prepared to accept the statement by the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) in defence of himself, but should be no intimation from the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) that there is anything required by way of proceedings in this Legislature, and I think if the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) would confine himself to his own defence, I will be quite willing to accept it.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I will finish in just a moment, and, of course, I will abide by your ruling.

I will close by stating that what I said on Tuesday, and what I have substantiated this afternoon, suggest to me that what I quoted from Life Magazine the other day to the effect that:

> "Steep Rock might be Mr. Eaton's smartest venture yet, and his gamble is paying off handsomely",

may turn out to be a piece of British understatement.

Nothing that I have said is to be taken in any way as reflecting on those brilliant Canadian who are managing the Steep Rock enterprise, or such great Americans as Dr. Hugh Roberts, the distinguished geologist, who played such

an outstanding role in the development of this vast mining operation at Steep Rock.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

(1) The Twenty-Second Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission for the year ended March 31, 1949.

(2) The Twenty-Ninth Anhual Report of the Public Service Superannuation Board of Ontario, for the fiscal year ended the 31st of March, 1949.

(3) The Forty-Eighth Annual Report of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, for the fiscal year ended the 31st of December, 1949.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table replies to questions 5, 17, 18 and 48. There are more to follow.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8.

DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order, "resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the honourable, the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the Session", Mr. Frost.

(Take B follows)

MR. J. NEWMAN (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would first like to express my regards to you. I am sure that we all appreciate your many kindnesses to the members and the very fair way in which you administer the rules of this House.

I would like to offer my congratulations to the Hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) I would say that he was the mostpopular choice of the Party. A man who has given years of service to this Government. His pleasant personality, I am sure, will stimulate better relations between this Government and our Government at Ottawa.

I would also like to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Speech from the Throne. One would gather from their remarkds that the Liberal group made no contribution to their being in this House as Members of this Government. I would also like to extend my sympathy to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) and to the hon. Member for Eglington (Mr. Blackwell) and hope for their speedy recovery.

During the past summer Rainy River district was favoured with visits from two important groups from this Legislative. First - The Committee on Soil Conservation. This, in our estimation, is a very important Committee composed of men who have a background of experience and training that will make their findings valuable to this Province and particularly to the newer parts of Ontario. I hope to speak more fully on their visit to the Rainy River District after their report has been presented.

Then, the Committee from the whole House under our hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) made a

more complete tour of our District, saw more of its industrial growth, and more of its tourist facilities and a quick view of our agricultural area. Developments within our District were somewhat of a surprise to them. I am sure that few of them realized that this area had, in the past 50 years, grown and developed in the manner that it has. I am sure that they are fully aware of its possibilities for future development. I would also like to venture a guess that the needs of this area receive more consideration in the future, due in no small way to this Committee's findings.

I am confident that few people from the east realize that there is approximately a million acres of land available for agricultural use in this part of the Province and that less than one-half of it has ever been for agricultural purposes. It is also common knowledge that our growing season compares very favourable with that of Guelph, and that there is only a few hours difference in the amount of sunshine between these two locations. We feel that our chief agricultural needs are more farmers. A continuation of the land clearing and drainage program.

This progject has been carried out in the past at a lower cost than in any other part of the Province. The benefits from it are very evident and I would like to urge the Government to continue this valuable program.

We also have need for assistance to enable our farmers to increase the livestock on their farms.

The extension of roads throughout the eastern part of our District would greatly aid agricultural growth. Make our farm products available from Fort Frances east to the lakehead cities.

The extension of hydro throughout the Rainy River District has been of great benefit to our small towns and farming areas. There is nothing that I can recall that has tended to modernize and stimulate activities in these areas to such an extent. The continuation of this project is of great importance and I would urge the Government to complete this program and if necessary, underwrite the cost of it over a period of ten to twenty years. We are in this position with Hydro: those who have it feel very enthusiastic about it--those who do not have it, feel that they have been passed up or neglected. There are, I understand, about 1,200 applications on hand for service. The cost of finishing this program and underwriting it over a period of years would be largely covered by increased hydro revenue and further rural development.

Government policy on forestry and forest management is of very great importance to us. Using forestry products in the Rainy River District we have the J.A. Matheau Lumber Company, the Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company and many smaller timber operators and jobbers. The J.A. Matheau Company operate a sawmill, employ many men and I am sure that the government realize the importance of keeping an important industry such as this supplied with timber products. Mr. Matheau was a former Member of this House and made a great contribution to the growth and development of the Rainy River District. The Ontario and Minnesota Pulp and Paper Company, our laargest industry,have a large plant in Fort Frances and operate several of their own logging camps in the eastern part of the District. They have a very large investment in plants and equipment and are very conscious of

forest conservation. They have spent no end of time and money in conserving their timber limits so that the operation of their large plant can be based on a continuous operation over many years. Their interest in having their timber limits that will allow them to make their cut each year on a sustained yield basis is a very far-sighted program and one that should receive the support of this Government. I trust that the Government in their dealings with them will make available sufficient timber to allow their operation to carry on this far-sighted program.

The company operate very modern logging camps, working conditions there are of the best, camp facilities include modern laundries, recreation rrooms, moving pictures once a week. And in other words each camp is a modern community within itself.

Their paper mill in the town of Fort Fraenes is a modern plant which also has good working conditions and the relationship between management and employees is of the best. There is also a high wage scale. Their employees are all good citizens of our town and play an important part in all our community activities. The management are not only keenly interested in the operation of their plant but in all activities throughout the Rainy River District.

Mr. Speaker, the Rainy River District is recognized as one of the largest tourist areas in this Province. It is our fourth largest port of entry. Our camp owners have large investments and facilities for catering to the needs and wishes of any tourist. They are also keenly interested in the preservation of our game and co-operate with the government and their officers in enforcing their rules and regulations in this regard.

We have a large tourist area that has been used very little and can only be made available to this industry when the government see fit to extend our main highway east. The revenue in opening up this new area will add large sums to the treasury and aid this very important industry to grow and expand.

Mr. Speaker, when the Committee from the whole House visited the Rainy River District, their first stop was at Atikokan and Steep Rock Iron Mines. This was a source of satisfaction to me. Too often delegates from the Legislature never find time to visit the eastern part of our District. It was particularly gratifying to find that it was possible for the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell) to visit this important centre and see for himself the progress that has been made since first starting this mine. I am sure that he and the members of the Committee saw it as a great development, that a few years ago had been donsidered almost impossible and during 1949 produced one million and a quarter tons of high grade iron ore. Further developments since their visit are the opening up of two more iron ore bodies, one additional by the Steep Rock Iron Mines. This will possibly boost their production in the near future to four million tons of ore--another that has been leased to the Inland Steel Company on a royalty basis. will possibly increase production another three million tons--making a total production in the next few years of seven million tons of high grade ore.

MR. A.A.MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Do you know who collects the Royalty on the ore sold?

MR. NEWMAN: I suppose it would be Steep Rock.

These figures may sound fantastic especially since it has been said that a large country the size of Russia only

produce 20 million tons a year. In Canada from 1850 to 1946 inclusive, we were only able to produce 8½ million tons of ore. During the period 1945 to 1949 inclusive, Steep Rock produced 4½ million tons. While this mine was being developed, the mine management and the citizens of Atikokan left nothing undone to get the town of Atikokan growing in the same progressive manner. In the town of Atikokan we now find a well-planned carefully laid-out town, the housing progject that has been subsidized by the mine furnishing the mine employees with as fine homes as you will find anywhere, all modern conveniences, a large modern school, a new hospital, street lighting and adequate taxi and bus service. The 1950 building program for this town, we believe, will include the erection of a new hotel, new bank buildings, two new theatres and many other small businesses. The growth and expansion of this area that should take place in the next few years could well mean 50 to 75 million dollars spent for goods, and material within the Dominion of Canada. All of the goods and equipment that are needed would have a very high labour content. Some of the many things that would be required would be iron ore cars that could possibly be produced at Hamilton. Transmission line material from Noranda and Toronto, possibly 20 lake boats at a cost of approximately a million dollars each, which could be produced at Port Arthur and Fort William, double tracking that will be required from Atikokan to the Lakehead. Requiring rails that would be produced at Sault St. Marie, and concrete that could be produced within the Province, heavy trucks and other equipment that could be produced at Windsor and Oshawa, the enlarging of the iron ore docks at Fort William and Port Arthur using local material. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this

expansion and growth and the material required for it will make a worth while contribution to solving some of our unemployment, which seems to be increasing these days. The President and one of the strongest driving forces of this company sat in this House for many years and no doubt has made many worth while contributions to the growth and development of this Province.

A delegation such as the Committee of the whole House who visit a mine such as this for the first time, do not always go away with the complete picture of how the mine was developed, and how it has to function. Apparently the hon. Member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) was no exception because I notice that in the Port Arthur News Chronicle of November 24th, 1949, that he is reported to have said:

> "1. Steep Rock ores are going to the United States but Canadians are buying back U.S. Steel products at much higher prices."

We do not agree with these thoughts and I would like to take time to express our views which are along the following lines:

> "The advantage to Canada in the present U.S.-Canadian trade situation of a U.S. dollar market at premium prices for all the ore that Steep Rock can ship is an obvious one. It is a new item of trade which already means millions annually.
> The economics of the complicated iron-steel export situation involving Canada and the United States as well as the technical problems concerned have just been studied by a leading Canadian authority, P.E. Cavanagh of the Department of Metallurgy, Ontario

Research Foundation. He points out that iron and steel are produced from a mixture of natural ores of varying types and richness. Steep Rock's output is classed among the cream of all North American ores. There is a neat profit to be gained for Canada by exporting the scarcer and higher-priced ores even while Canadian steel-makers are still importing lower-priced American ores which are, by comparison, in plentiful supply.

Canada's steel imports are now largely confined to specialty types and shapes which, due to the limited Canadian demand, it is much cheaper to import than to produce. For example, Canda uses 1,000 tons annually of an unusual thick steel plate. To make it here would require a capital outlay of more than $1 million on equipment. The history of the Canadian steel industry has been that, as soon as Canadian demand for a specific steel rose to the point at which it became economic to produce it here, the Dominion's own steel industry then proceeded to expand and supply the need."

Then again the hon. Member (Mr. MacLeod) is reported to have said:

"2. Ore dock, power lines, railway spur lines and rolling stock such as ore cars, were paid with tax monies.

In the Steep Rock area both the transportation services and the power lines are government-owned by the C.N.R. and the Ontario Hydro respectively. Each providing the necessary facilities in

its own field, but did so on a basis which made the outlay a profitable investment in the strictest sense of the term. Steep Rock's rate of payment for such services will retire all capital outlays involving plus profits which make these expenditures very good business indeed for those organizations which supply its power and shipping needs. No question of subsidy has entered into the development.

The lack of iron ore was long a serious problem in Canada's economy particularly industrial Ontario. For that reason, the Province of Ontario in 1937 passed a special act under which shipping ores of the Steep Rock grades, produced and treated in Ontario, might receive a bounty of approximately $1 per ton. Steep Rock has never made application for any bounty under this act and to date, the mine has produced 4,400,000 tons."

Without which the development could not have been a success. Then again the article further states:

"3. Stepp Rock is 'largely controlled' by American funds.

In the same sense, Steep Rock is also "largely controlled" by Canadian interests.

There is not only a large interest in the undertaking on the part of private American investors but that of U.S. government agencies, recently increased, runs into millions. That the various freedoms practised by Canadian and Americans extend as far as participation by the Government of the United States in the development of a basic industry within Canada must undoubtedly be

puzzling to a spokesman for interests which, as a matter of policy, view all such examples of co-operation with suspicion.

But the origin of official U.S. interest in Canada's Steep Rock should be well known to these critics of its growth. The record drain on America's limited reserves of high-grade iron ore caused by the European-Pacific war could have created a critical situation had the struggle been prolonged. There was no other proven and easily accessible major new source in North America. The United States took financial steps and Canada took action to insure that Steep Rock should be brought to large scale production without delay. The strategic importance of Steep Rock has not changed under the present peace-time economy.

As far as the division of Canadian and American shareholder interest is concerned, both are large and the records show that both have increased as the properties developed. Canadians launched this undertaking and did the original financing. When the existence of ore-bodies was established, Americans not only provided financing which could not have been secured from any other source but also the experience in marketing and the knowledge of the steel industry without which the development could not have been a success. The composition of the board of directors shows that the Steep Rock enterprise is jointly managed by Americans and Canadians as well as jointly owned, the American

representation headed by Chairman Cyrus S. Eaton of Cleveland, the Canadian by President Donald M. Hogarth of Toronto

The article further states, and then again:

"4. Steep Rock ores could be processed into 'sponge iron' in the area where mined instead of being shipped to existing steel-makers.

MR. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Are you still quoting me?

MR. NEWMAN: Yes.

"The development or expansion of a steel industry is governed by markets as well as by raw materials and is normally a matter of slow growth. Even with Steep Rock's output increased to 7 million tons annually, which will take some years to accomplish, geologists and engineers consider that the full potentialities of the range are not yet fully known. Technical tests have been proceeding in Sweden and elsewhere ever since early shipments of ore were made but it is only within the last few weeks that steel experts have been able to state positively that these Canadian ores are exceptionally well-suited to such new processes as direct-reduction."

(Page B-12 follows)

Then again in reference to the remarks of the hon.member from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), in his reply to the Speech from the Throne, he stated that Mr. Cyrus Eaton had been given a million and a half shares of Steep Rock at the small price of one cent each and that this stock, during the past year, had paid him during the past year a clear profit of 20 cents per share. Mr. Speaker, this is hardly the case.

It is true that a million and a half shares were given to Mr. Eaton but it was for the purpose of bonusing those who would buy debentures in the company. The development at that time was not considered sound, our Canadian investors were not willing to contribute more, American financiers were not willing to buy debentures in Steep Rock without a bonus. A very large portion of this million and a half shares was used for this purpose, and it may be possible that Mr. Eaton had a few left fof himself.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: That is the difference between 1,437,000 and 1,500,000.

MR. NEWMAN: At that time Steep Rock Iron Mines were endeavouring to borrow five million dollars from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. They were not willing to make this loan unless Steep Rock could sell two and a quarter million dollars of debentures. At this stage of the mine development, the mine that the hon. members of this House saw last summer, it was a lakeful of water and not a very attractive proposition to anyone with money.

During those years rushing the development of this

mine was considered an emergency measure by both Canada and the United States, and the cost of bringing the mine into production ran to possibly a million dollars more than would have been under ordinary circumstances.

There were many other occasions when this mine had to have large sums of money. Mr. Cyrus Eaton on many occasions bought more stock in the company at regular market prices which at times ran well over $3.00 per share.

The 20 cents per share profit that the hon. member referred to possibly was retained by him on the small balance that he had left, but the larger percentage of this stock was used as I have mentioned, was used for bonusing purposes to those who furnished capital during the days that the mine wasnot a sure proposition.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the $240,000. which the hon. member stated was given to Steep Rock Iron Mines by our federal government, this grant is made yearly by the federal government to the C.N.R. for expansion and further building of their railway spur and iron ore docks at the Lakehead cities. There has never been a penny of this money at any time used by Steep Rock Iron Mines.

The growth and development within the Rainy River district during the past years has always been greatly aided by assistance from the various governments. This government, in that line, have been no exception. They have contributed generously to the extension of hydro, clearing of land and the continuous improvement of our road system in the western part of the district. Notwithstanding all this, there has been no effort made in supplying the people in the fast-growing communities of Atikokon and Steep Rock

with a highway outlet.

In a province such as this, with over four million people, it sounds rather unusual to me that such a thriving community, with the industrial growth that has taken place, would be left without road facilities of any kind. They are isolated from the rest of the province except by air or rail travel.

Surely, with the taxing possibilities of this great enterprise, this government, in their highway spending program that they have announced, will have made provision for the opening up of a road between Atikokan and the Lakehead cities in their 1950 program. I do hope that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), whom we regard very highly as a practical and far-sighted Cabinet Minister, will be able to say that this highway is included in his immediate program.

I am sure that our hon. Premier (Mr. Frost), who was a former Minister of Mines, and the present hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell) are also well aware of the need for this highway. Nothing would make me more happy and the people of this part of northwestern Ontario than to know that this important section of road will receive immediate attention and be built in 1950.

Mr. Speaker, this great enterprise is in my riding. I feel it my duty to correct the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) in his views, and to present these facts for the benefit of the hon. members of this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, rising to take part in this speech from the Throne, I want to congratulate the mover of the reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds), and also the seconder, the hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr. Leger). Both of these hon. members delivered a very splendid address to this House.

I want to congratulate the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Gemmell) and the hon. member for Wallington South (Mr. Hamilton) who have been promoted from private members to that in a position with the Cabinet.

Representing the historic county of Glengarry, may I state the first Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario was John Sandfield McDonald, and he represented Glengarry in this House. I may add also that the former Premier of this Dominion, namely, Wm. Lyon McKenzie King, was Glengarry's Federal representative until the Federal election held in June of last year.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. VILLENEUVE: I am honoured indeed to be called to serve this historic county in this Legislature, and I fully realize that with this honour comes a great responsibility, and I trust that I may be given the wisdom commensurate with the task.

The county of Glengarry, situated as it is at the eastern extremity of this great province, and being predominately agricultural and in close proximity to the great city of Montreal, is naturally dependent on that city's market for the sale of our farm produce. Ninety per cent of the farm income is derived from the livestock industry and dairy farming is very general throughout the county

and large quantities of milk are produced. Since the market available to us for fluid milk is chiefly in the city of Montreal we are at all times very anxious that cordial relations and good understanding should prevail with the Province of Quebec, and it is only natural that we must comply with the laws and regulations that are made and enforced by the Government of that province in regard to market requirements. If restrictions were imposed on Ontario farmers that would cause a curtailment of the flow of this farm produce, it would most certainly have an adverse effect on our farming population, because for two generations, at least, this fluid milk market has given in financial returns to our farmers, one-third more revenue than any other market available to us.

Cheese manufacturing, along with some butter, plays a very important part in the consumption of milk in the county. We also produce many field crops of various species, much of it coarse grains for feeding and raising of hogs and poultry. The farmers in my county appreciate the sincere interest in their problems shown by the Minister of Agriculture in this Province. Due to war years, research and expansion work was not permitted to expand as it would have in normal years. The Artificial Insemination Act passed in 1947 by the Legislature, giving grants to licenced units, has been a tremendous step forward in improving the quality of dairy cattle in this Province. The Kemptville unit, which serves ten of the eastern counties, maintains sires of Holstein and Ayrshire breeds that are much superior in breeding value to those owned by many individual farmers in that area, and I am pleased to see the policy of the Department being further advanced by the organization of Dairy Herd Improvement Associations (24-26 members). Pure

bred herds have been given service known as the R.O.P., and this service is provided by the Federal Department of Agriculture to the better farmers who have a higher financial standing than the average, but the Dairy Herd Improvement Association renders a service to reach the smaller farmer, with limited financial resources, who may own a herd of grade cattle, or mixed grade and pure bred herd. These are the type of services which are of real value in helping the farmer, who asks nothing more than guidance and leadership, to stand on his own feet. This service will also enable the farmer to find out what his cost of production is in producing milk and this is accomplished by having a supervisor visit each member of the Association once a month. This supervisor weighs each cow's production of milk night and morning during each visit, takes a sample at each milking of the individual animal and tests these samples. Finally he is required to collect data relative to the amount of feed consumed and cost of same, as well as cost of any items which enter into the cost of producing milk. Milking records are compiled in the office of the Ontario Livestock Branch on the basis of figures supplied by these supervisors. As a result of this information he will be in a position to compare the standing of his herd with those of others in the Association. This work is expanding all the time and within the next six months, information should be obtained that will contain very interesting figures as to the production per cow on a yearly basis. One known fact will be that there is a very wide variation and that there are too many low-producing cows. In spite of all efforts we put forth in regard to good leadership to the farmers of this Province, in my estimation, until the Federal Government considers and studies the

agricultural position in its true light, so as to allow a farmer a just and fair deal when computing income tax, there is no encouragement for them to stay on the farm. The farmer must necessarily be allowed the same hours per week scale to arrive at cost production as is in use with organized labour. When that is done it will encourage the youth to stay on the farm and help relieve to some extent the housing situation that is so prevalent and disturbing in all great urban centres, we have felt that for many years Governments have been negligent in many respects with regard to the needs of the farmer and up until 1943 less than 20 per cent of our farmers in Glengarry were provided with electricity, and we all know if there is any place where hydro is very essential and necessary it is certainly on a dairy farm where it can save so much hard labour and where the laws of nature make long hours of work necessary.

Our employment situation on the farms is most acute due in part to the long hours that one must labour and the natural desire of our young people to find employment in the cities where hours of labour are much shorter and the salaries much more attractive.

When this Government came into power in 1943 it reduced the cost of hydro power per K.W.H. from as high as $54.52 per hour to $39.00 per K.W.H.

AN hon. MEMBER: We are not there yet.

MR. VILLENEUVE: Two years after the war struggle was over things really started to roll and rural hydro lines were built in my county which are very much appreciated. I should like at this time to give you a contrast that I believe is a very interesting picture in figures. At the beginning of 1947 Glengarry county had 303 miles of rural

hydro line constructed with a total of 1445 consumers. It took a period of 26 years to attain this amount. From 1947 until the end of this year, 1950, we will have added over 200 miles of rural hydro in the county and will have a total of 2789 rural consumers. In other words, 100 less rural consumers have been added in a little over three years than what took 26 years to build previous to this. The hydro criticism leveled at this Government last year has been unfair in many respects but with the aid of providence combined with nature rainfall has been sufficient to meet power requirements and one observes very noticeably how the oppsoition have lost their punch when speaking on this subject. Eastern Ontario is most desirous of having the St. Lawrence development started at the earliest possible date. This development will mean to eastern Ontario what the Niagara development has been to Central Ontario. One cannot visualize the magnitude of its scope and the effect it will have on the expansion of industry and increase in population in that part of the Province. We have No. 34 highway running in a north-south direction through the centre of our county and for twelve years this highway for a distance of twelve miles was very dangerous because it was paved on one side only. Many serious accidents occurred and it was commonly called suicide lane by the residents of the district. I am very pleased indeed that this portion of that highway has been completely resurfaced and I am sure that more will be completed in my county this year so as to keep the highways of this province up to a high standard.

Our Municipal and County roads systems have been greatly improved in recent years and that has been due in no small part because of the increased grants from this

Government and the fact that our present Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is perhaps one of the best qualified men to occupy that position in this Province in many years.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. VILLENEUVE: Mr. Speaker, this will give you pretty much the picture of the service rendered to my county and to other Eastern counties whose position is very much similar to that of Glengarry.

The needs for service to the people which rightfully belong to them cannot be ignored indefinitely and in 1948 many stalwart Leberals were instrumental in seeing to it that a change must be made.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Are we now changing the rules and custom concerning reading of speeches? Is that the understanding? That is what is being done here.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

MR. MILLARD: As long as I can do it, all right.

AN hon. MEMBER: It is a good thing you came back to see what is going on. These fellows work for a living, and have not the same experiences as you have.

MR. VELLENEUVE: I am not here as a partisan but as a servant to the people I represent and as long as I am here that will be the policy I shall follow. We in Eastern Ontario are most anxious to have No. 7 highway completed from Perth, eastward, connecting No. 43 and eastward to the Quebec border at the earliest possible date. This will divert much of the commercial traffic from No. 2 highway which is most hazardous to tourists and other motorists and in particular during the heavy tourist season and will afford a great access to farm produce from the eastern

counties going to Montreal markets. This Government's generous grants to education have been very much appreciated in Glengarry county and the amounts paid out to the various school boards throughout this Province speak for themselves when a comparison is made with other Government expenditures up and until the year 1943. The same can be said of health with its generous grants towards hospitals. I would like to refer to another department in particular and with a little more detail, namely, the Department of Welfare, which has extended its servies in recent years over a very large field and now has very large expenditures. The reorganization which has taken place in this Department towards facilitating faster returns to applicants for pension has been really remarkable. When one stops to consider that there are almost 90,000 people who receive old age and blind pensions in this Province every month and that an average of 1100 pensioners die each and every month and that there are an average of 1800 new applicants every month, making an increase of 700 for the same period. One can understand the tremendous amount of work involved in keeping the filing systems in an orderly manner. Over $40,000,000 will be distributed in Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1950, and with the increased monthly average that is taking place this will exceed $46,000,000 next year. It may be interesting to note that through the generous consideration of pensioners in this Province the average amount of pensions paid out per month is $39.00 per person.

AN hon. MEMBER: Who can get fat on that?

MR. VILLENEUVE: Twenty-five per cent of the cost for Children's Aid Societies in the Province has been a tremendous increase on the municipalities from year to year.

But money spent on these innocent and helpless children will be a sound investment for the future in helping them along life's highway to become useful citizens of tomorrow. One can see today in the growth of juvenile delinquency what parental neglect means, but in all seriousness I am afraid the weight of essential welfare costs may well bring a partial if not complete collapse of our economic system, if a contributory scheme is not inaugurated in the immediate future. The unprecendented expansion of welfare expenditures during the period when the country had its greatest boom and the fullest employment in its history is in itself a warning of the demands which will follow. Alarming loss of revenue to the farmers in the form of deflated prices makes one wonder the effect this situation will bring about in contributing to unemployment. It is truly remarkable that this Government has been able to balance its budget and at the same time perform these services.

SOME Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. VILLENEUVE: I could go along to other Departments, namely, Lands and Forests, but to truly appreciate the great work being done by this Department one has to travel the great area of Northern Ontario. There you will see their farseeing policy in practice.

Law enforcement and Administration has increased in cost to this Province in order to be kept at a high standard of efficiency.

The other departments of which, perhaps, I am not se well acquainted, have all kept abreast with the march of time.

I am very proud to have been associated with the Hon. George Drew and I may add also that I was equally proud to have served under the present Minister of Agriculture.

ture (Mr. Kennedy), who was the Prime Minister of this Province until last Spring. Since the last Session we have met and have chosen a new Leader, and as we look at the long list of great men who have lead this banner Province in this Legislature we might ask ourselves what makes a man great. The Bible tells us "He that would be greatest among you, let him be the servant of all."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN hon. MEMBER: Which do you like to hear the best?

AN hon. MEMBER: They are all good to hear.

MR. VILLENEUVE: I submit that in the light of that truth our present Premier ranks high. His whole life has been devoted to serving his community and his country. In his chosen profession of Law he has served his district well and is a credit to his profession. However, the great gifts with which he is endowed are not confined solely to the field of political leadership. And I know of no other quality that would endear him more to the hearts of the people than the fine example he has set both in his family life which is reflected in his happy home surroundings and by his kindly solicitude at all times towards all members of my race. His wide knowledge and intimate understanding of our problems have won for him a following among the French-Canadian people in this Province that was never enjoyed by too many Conservative leaders for many years.

AN hon. MEMBER: Especially the one just before him.

MR. VILLENEUVE: I speak with sincerity when I say at no time have we stood higher in the estimation of all citizens in this Province as a party and we are indebted to Hon. Leslie Frost (Prime Minister), who by his sincerity and devotion to duty has won our admiration and support.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I hope that in participating in this debate I can set at rest the fears of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) that the Opposition has lost its punch. Before the Opposition is through he will be only too happy to admit that it has all the punch it had a year ago and more to start with.....

(Take C follows)

as a consequence of the record of the government in the intervening period.

I would like to join with other hon. members of the House in congratulating the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on his accession to office, and to assure him that we want to work with him in the best possible way in the general interests of this community, and that while we may have our political differences with him, we have a very high regard for him as a person.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say we are very happy that you decided to continue as the Speaker of the House, and not leave us for the Cabinet benches. We are always sure that when you are in the Chair you will rule this House fairly and equally to all sides.

Before I embark upon the main burden of my remarks, I cannot help but comment on the contribution made to the Throne Speech Debate by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Newman). I was, frankly disappointed that he, as a spokesman for the working people of that part of the country, should have allowed himself to be merely a defender of the position of the Steep Rock Corporation. I speak with a little feeling about this matter, because I am a steel worker, and the employees of the Steel Rock Iron Ore Mines are steel workers, and I know a little of the situation they find themselves in at the present time.

I know, for instance, the company which he defended so vigorously, is now actively and continuously attempting to prevent a wage increase to the hundreds of employees in that area, who are his constituents, while they are making the large and substantial profits they have been making over the years. I

Know, too, the Steep Rock Iron Ore Company has been exploiting our Canadian resources, and I cannot agree with him that it is a sound thing for us to ship ton after ton of iron ore, as he says, over into the United States, while we lack sufficient steel facilities in this country to meet our own demands. We in Canada are short, not the "thousand special tons" he mentioned of heavy plate steel, but we are short in Canada a million tons of steel, and a steel mill at the head of the lakes, or in some other place close to those resources, would be a great gift to Canada.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: I was shocked that one coming from that part of the province should suggest that a steel mill was not needed.

Mr. Speaker, to return to the remarks I had prepared before I came into the House, I would like to point out to the House that a few days ago the Bureau of Public Opinion showed that the Canadian public regards farm markets and the problem of defining the farm income and unemployment -- those two problems -- as their major concern at the present time.

I think the optimism which we heard expressed in this House a year ago about the conditions which then prevailed, and which it was suggested would prevail for all time, is not here in spite of the very fine face that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) can put on all circumstances and all conditions.

A year ago, even then, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) was beginning to have his doubts, because he spoke to us about the coming "levelling-off process". Well, we have got "levelled-off" I guess. There are now 380,000

unemployed in this country, and they are pretty far down, as far as "levelling-off" is concerned. There are 90,000 unemployed right here in the province of Ontario. Those are the figures which are available from the Dominion government, figures of registered unemployed persons seeking work through national employment services. In my opinion they are figures which are too low. They do not represent the total picture of unemployment in this country.

There are a great many people who are not eligible for unemployment insurance, because they do not come within the meaning of the Act, and perhaps do not avail themselves of the national employment services. There are a great many others whom I think have given up any hope that the national employment services can provide them with jobs, therefore, they are not found in that figure of 380,000.

If I were to give an estimate, I think my view would be much more in line with the view expressed by the major labour congresses in this country. The unemployment figure, in Canada, I would suggest is closer to 450,000, and about 125,000 are in the province of Ontario. Whichever figure you accept, whether the official figure given by the Department of Labour at Ottawa, or the estimate made by the labour congresses as the true picture of unemployment, these figures indicate we have passed the danger mark in our economy, a danger mark about which we ought to be concerned.

At the present time, the registered unemployment in this country represents about 7.4 per cent of the total labour force. That is the figure given on February 1st. Considering the figures of the two labour congresses, you will find

the unemployed figure runs to 9 per cent or 10 per cent of the total working force in this country, and even the Financial Post, in its wisdom, suggests that when we pass the 4 per cent mark, we are passing the danger mark. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are well past it, and I am certain the plans offered to this House by the government are not so much as will meet the dangerous situation, which is growing in this province, and which I fear the government is only too anxious to ignore.

We have been told that unemployment is just "seasonal"; that it is something which is here because we are in the winter season, and that it will go, some time in the future. This statement, given by the Hon. Humphrey Mitchell, the Minister of Labour at Ottawa, seems to be only too well accepted by the government opposite. However, I want to warn the government, that the Hon. Humphrey Mitchell is a very, very, very poor predictor, when it comes to unemployment. He was the gentleman who, in 1938, was sent out, then as a civil servant representing the Department of Labour, to the city of Vancouver to investigate the unemployment situation there, and he came back from Vancouver with the rosiest of pictures about the situation, and assured everybody, in 1938, that nothing would happen on the west coast, that there was nothing to worry about, but a few weeks later there were unemployed riots in the city of Vancouver. Hon. Mr. Mitchell's capacity to judge the situation is not such that I would recommend it to this government as a basis for forming their own judgment as to what the situation is.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a great many significant declines in employment, in industries which are not affected by seasonal considerations, and I would like to put on the

record a table of decline in employment taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, with regard to employment. This is a figure based on the index of July 1, 1941, as one hundred. I place these figures on the record merely to indicate that the condition has not been confined to seasonal industries, but applies to other industries as well.

	Dec. 1948	Dec. 1949	Decline
Other Lumber Products Mfg.	126.5	106.8	19.7
Pulp and Paper Products	133.5	123.5	10.0
Rubber Products	133.4	123.6	9.8
Woollen Yarn and Clothing Mfg.	111.6	102.2	9.4
Hosiery and Knit Goods	122.8	115.9	[illegible]
Crude, Rolled and Forged Products (iron and steel)	144.7	134.0	10.7
[illegible]	118.4	109.9	8.5
Agricultural Implements	206.3	167.4	38.9
Steel Shipbuilding & Repairing	89.3	64.5	24.[illegible]
Foundry and machine Products	98.4	88.1	10.3
Non-ferrous metal Products	121.0	111.7	9.3
Logging	221.7	155.8	65.9

It is important to note that except for the first two industries and the last one listed, none of the others could said to have suffered a drop in employment due to purely seasonal factors. It should be pointed out that these comparisons are made for the same month each year.

It is quite clear that the great bulk of these industries are not of the seasonal kind. There have been genuine declines in employment, aside from the declines which one expects in the winter period from the seasonal industries. I might point out the figures I was quoting were for December, 1948 and

December, 1949, both of them winter months, and there would be no effect of differences because of the times of the year there.

A year ago, in this House, we were all assured that the high employment which then prevailed was due exclusively to the virtues of private enterprise. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to suggest, as a consequence, that this unemployment situation has come as a consequence of the private-enterprise system. This unemployment is as much part and parcel of the private enterprise system as the high employment spoken of a year ago. The history of private enterprise, the history of capital, is the history of "boom and bust". Well, we have had our "boom" brought about by the war, and it looks as if we well may be on the way to the "bust". In spite of the situation of unemployment and declining farm prices, profits in this country remain quite high.

The farmer suffers from a decline in his income, the workers suffer as a consequence of unemployment, but, nevertheless, the profits continue. The statistics from the National Bureau of Statistics show that corporations' profits, since the end of the war, were as follows:

In 1945, they were $1,181,000.

In 1946, $1,410,000,000.

In 1947, $1,796,000,000.

1948, $2,060,000,000.

Between 1945 and 1948 corporation profits increased by 74 per cent, and between 1938 and 1948, they were up 468.2 per cent.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): That is good for the Tory party.

MR. PARK: Mr. Speaker, I take the figures for 1948

because they were the ones which were left available. Anybody who has followed the press in the last few months, and seen the publication of the financial statements for 1949, will know that in 1949, profits continued to grow.

This problem of unemployment, Mr. Speaker, is, in my mind, part and parcel of the private enterprise system, and part and parcel of that drive for profits, which is represented in the figures which I have given to the House.

There is a feature of the unemployment problem which disturbs me, and about which I would like to speak for a few moments. There has been, in my mind, an unfortunate attempt to exploit the unemployment situation on racial and national grounds. There are those who are interested in using the naturally disturbed feelings of the people about the unemployment situation to exploit it on what I regard to be national and racial grounds. A great many workers have been told that the whole problem is on account of the displaced persons coming to Canada. It has been a common line shoved at the labour movement in this country by the Communist Party --

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, that is an absolute lie, if that is parliamentary.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I cannot accept that remark from the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg).

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) should withdraw that remark.

MR. PARK: Mr. Speaker, I ask for an unqualified withdrawal.

MR. SALSBERG: I am withdrawing it, but --

MR. SPEAKER: No; there will be no implication at all.

MR. SALSBERG: I withdraw it as unparliamentary.

MR. PARK: Mr. Speaker, the Communist Party, in order to exploit the labour situation, has played on the D.P. question, and I am very unhappy that they have attempted to use these displaced persons. As a matter of fact, the number of displaced persons in Canada, up to the end of 1949, was just over 92,000, and that included old people, children, and everything else. If one half of them are, in fact, in the working forces, it would be a large percentage, I would think, and to suggest that that small number is the cause of unemployment, as has been done in some sections of the labour movement, is doing a great dis-service to the workers of this country, by throwing up a smoke screen, which can only result in racial animosity, and I would ask those who are indulging in it to stop it right away.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: The real reason for unemployment does not lie along those lines. The real reason for unemployment is hidden behind the kind of talk that goes on about the "D.P.'s", and their supposedly causing unemployment.

What I want to see -- and I think what the labour movement generally wants to see, and what we in this group want to see -- is a general program which will aim at spreading available jobs and which will create new ones.

Hear, Mr. Speaker, I should perhaps refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) and the

hon. member for Cochrane, North (Mr. Leger), when they spoke in opening this debate. I would like to congratulate them on their remarks. They did a very excellent job of reviewing the record of the government in its various departments, but I have searched far into Hansard, and I could find them saying nothing in the way of commendation of what was going on in the field of labour, or in the field of the Labour Department. I think the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) should register a protest about the matter, but probably it was because they, too, felt some dissatisfaction that the Labour Department was not meeting this situation properly, and they just could not find it in themselves to say kind things about that department, as they did about the others.

As a matter of fact, as I listened to the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) this afternoon, I thought he was going to try and repair the damage, but he mentioned pretty nearly all of the others, but again forgot about the Labout Department, and I am coming to the conclusion that perhaps the Labour Department is the forgotten department of this government.

I suggested a year ago to the Labour Department that they promote legislation for a forty-hour work week, and for increased vacations with pay, in order to spread available employment. However, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) scoffed at that suggestion, and would not hear of it. I think if he had accepted that suggestion a year ago, the unemployment situation might not be as acute today as it is, but he chose to turn it aside. I hope he will now reconsider his position, and that now, in the course of this Session, legislation

aimed at spreading available employment will be brought down, and I can assure him if he brings forward that legislation, he will have the wholehearted support and co-operation from this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the course of this debate to date about the plight of the unemployed, speaking of sleeping on boards at the various hostels around this city. I know a little of the problems of the unemployed from first-hand, because, like a good many others, a few years ago I was amongst them, and I know a little about life in the hostels, because I spent a little while in one of them. They are not the kind of a place that you could recommend to anyone.

I had the opportunity, in 1945, when the Liberla ministry of that day turned the single unemployed out of their hostels in the city of Toronto, cut them off completely, of observing at pretty close hand the attitude that had been caused by continued unemployment. I think it is fair to say that those men, at that time, as a consequence of their unemployment, had lost the energy and the will and the desire to do things, energy and will and desire which I am quite sure they had, and would have had, if they had jobs or had been adequately taken care of.

This brings me to the suggestion that there is an urgent need for an immediate relief program from this provincial government. The municipalities cannot much longer be expected to carry the burden alone. It is not a view that is expressed alone from this side of the House.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will recall that in January he received a telegram through the Toronto Welfare

Council, signed by a number of very prominent people in this part of the country, and I would like to put their names on the record.

Wm. H. Dewar, Executive Secretary, Community Chest of Greater Toronto.

H. Motton, Executive Secretary, Toronto Branch, Canadian Red Cross Society.

Major Phelps, Director of Social Services, Salvation Army.

Canon W. W. Judd, General Secretary, Canadian Diocese, Church of England.

Rev. John Frank, Rector, Holy Trinity Church.

Rev. F. G. Brisbin, Assistant Minister, Metropolitan United Church.

Rev. J. Lovelle Smith, Church of All Nations.

F. N. Stapleford, Executive Secretary, Neighborhood Workers Association.

Rev. John D. Sweeney, Director, Catholic Welfare Bureau.

Mrs. W. D. Clendining, Chairman, Board Samaritan Club.

Mrs. Leighton Elliott, President, Toronto Welfare Council.

Miss Florence Philpott, Executive Secretary, Toronto Welfare Council.

They telegraphed the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and several other hon. Cabinet Ministers here and at Ottawa, and this is what they said:

> "The Toronto Welfare Council has been instructed by the undersigned to forward you the following resolution adopted at a recent meeting called to discuss problems arising from unemployment in Greater Toronto.
>
> "Whereas the provision of relief for unemployed

employable persons is beyond the ability of existing private social services, and in view of the immediate and increasing crisis confronting local communities, we urge an immediate plan for emergency assistance from Federal and provincial governments be made available to meet the problem of unemployment at the local level stop AND Whereas this plan will only meet current needs, we strongly advocate that a long-range program to cope with unemployment problems be quickly formulated at a conference of Federal, provincial and municipal governments stop AND Whereas the continuance of unemployment without relief will undoubtedly lead to public disturbances, in all likelihood fomented by extreme elements, the real cause will be the feeling of depression on the part of men experiencing unrelieved suffering and privation for their families stop Therefore, we consider adequate privisions for the unemployed just as essential as any other program to safeguard Canada and its citizens.' "

The Welfare Council went further than that in its views on the matter. It wrote a letter to the Mayor and the Board of Control of the city of Toronto, detailing the telegram which I have just read to you, but saying much more, and I put the opinion of the Welfare Council on record, bacause I think it is generally accepted by everyone as being above political bias in this matter, being interested only in the welfare of the people.

This is the letter -- and I will not read the entire

letter to the House. If any hon. member wishes to see it in toto, they may -- but I would like to read certain quotations from it:

"It is with real concern that the Toronto Welfare Council observes the rising problem of unemployment without adequate provision having been made to meet the situation.....

.... We fully concur with the belief that the burden of this problem should not and cannot be borne by the municipality alone, and that assistance from the other levels of government is essential. The voluntary services in the field, while they exist to alleviate suffering to the limits of their capacity, cannot provide for the present unemployment situation. This responsibility for problems of unemployment has long been recognized as a public responsibility. .....

We wish to emphasize the importance of planning to meet needs arising from unemployment, be the unemployment seasonal or permanent. We would hope that such planning would make it possible for the needs of the unemployed person to be met in a dignified, humanitarian manner, not only to alleviate but to present hardships and possible evictions from homes. We believe it necessary to meet the needs of the unemployed because we have a responsibility to do the decent and right things for our citizens.

The Toronto Welfare Council is deeply concerned that because of lack of planning we again see soup kitchen "line-ups". While we appreciate the necessity

of providing food to the hungry, we deplore the fact that this and other undignified and outdated methods of handling the problem have been the ones to which the community is forced to resort. We also recognize that the general problem of unemployment has naturally brought many non-residents to Toronto in search of employment. This does not mean that they should be considered as vagrants or irresponsible persons, but it does emphasize the fact that the problem is a national problem.

It is our conviction that there should be Federal, Provincial and Municipal machinery which could be set in motion whenever unemployment of wide concern might arise."

Mr. Speaker, I can endorse wholeheartedly the demands of the Welfare Council that there ought to be immediately three government levels of action to meet this unemployment situation, because I am sure that unless there is such action, the municipalities will not be able to carry the burden much longer, and some of them, unless there is action taken now to correct the problem, are going to face bankruptcy in the future.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) the other day suggested that those of us who come from Toronto ridings ought to give consideration to this great metropolitan problem here. Well, that metropolitan problem is itself in part tied in with this question of the burden of unemployment relief. I would like to hear the government state its position on this matter.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) invited us to say something on the question, and I would like to put my view forward, on the matter, just for the record.

It has now become obvious that some integration of

services is needed in Toronto and the surrounding municipalities and new administrative machinery will have to be devised to provide these services on an integrated basis. Rising tax rates, unequal education costs, and standards, serious water and sewage problems, transportation and traffic difficulties, and an expanding housing program, can no longer be tackled adequately on a localized basis.

There are at least four different ways in which services could be integrated:

(1) By establishing metropolitan boards or commissions to provide specific services, such as a metropolitan water commission.

(2) By establishing a borough system for the metropolitan areas.

(3) By establishing a metropolitan county system, or,

(Take D follows)

Four, by a system of outright amalgamation, which has been proposed by the City of Toronto.

I think that careful consideration ought to be given to every one of the possibilities, because any program that is finally adopted will directly affect the lives of all the residents of this area for a great many years to come. It will affect provincial finances, and careful consideration will have to be given to such matters as provincial grants for education, welfare, highways, et cetera, et cetera, in the area.

And it is of utmost importance that no solution should be accepted until all its implications are thoroughly understood and explained as fully as possible to the residents of this area. I think one of the greatest difficulties that is going to be faced in meeting this question of the metropolitan problems of Toronto is not getting the information across to the people as to what the facts are, because so far we have had a great deal of heat on the subject and not too much light, and I hope that we will be able to get a great deal more light on the subject.

Several surveys of the situation have now been made, but there has not yet been time to complete the most important, and, I think, the most comprehensive survey that has been done. The Civic Advisory Council of Toronto, the Sub-Committee on Metropolitan Problems, which was set up, I understand, with the agreement and consent of all the heads of the municipalities in this area, has done a tremendous job of surveying the problem, and they are now presenting their proposals for a solution, and I think it would be unwise to rush into anything until we at least had

their recommendations before us. It is better to take time and devise a fair and practical plan than to force through quickly any ill-considered or arbitrary solution, especially in view of the importance and size of the problem.

A well-considered solution for Toronto and the Yorks -- and I sometimes think that hon. members from outside Toronto and the Yorks get disturbed by our discussion of these problems so often -- but a well-considered solution of the Toronto and Yorks problem, I think, can serve as a pattern for other centres where this interurban problem is growing up.

The hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) shakes his head. I guess he wants nothing at all out of Toronto, if he can avoid it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PARK: I think we are attempting to reach here a new stage in municipal government in Ontario, and it is important that whatever we do be done wisely and well. The provincial government has a great responsibility here, and it is its job to see that there is an orderly development of the system of municipal government, which is an integral part of the structure of democratic government in this province. The government itself must make its position clear with regard to its own financial responsibility.

I think the government has been in the position of demanding of the municipalities in the Toronto area that they say where they stand, while this government has so far declined to say where it stood with respect to its financial responsibilities.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: You cannot expect the communities around this area to know the full implications of the situation, the full implications of the various proposals that are advanced for the development of a metropolitan area, you cannot expect them to know those implications unless the government is prepared to state clearly just how far it is prepared to go, and what its financial demands are in the metropolitan area, and I would ask and urge that the government as soon as possible should make clear its position It would be far better that it should state its position clearly than to demand an answer from the municipalities by the deadline that has been set, without giving those municipalities an adequate opportunity of studying and settling the question amongst themselves, because I think there is a general recognition -- as I say, while there has been much heat and not much light -- there is a general recognition and there must be some new kind of development in this area, and it would be most unfortunate if the municipalities got the impression that a prepared program was being jammed down their respective throats, and I hope that the government will not pursue such a policy.

I would like for a few moments before sitting down, Mr. Speaker, to return for a few minutes to a discussion of economic problems. I mentioned at the outset of my remarks that the Gallup Poll had indicated that the problem of farm income and the problem of unemployment were the two things uppermost in the minds of Canadian citizens. And I think there is growing up a recognition that they

are almost the same problem, that the farmers cannot be prosperous when labour is not prosperous and labour, in addition, cannot enjoy prosperity when farmers are not prosperous. I think that we are seeing developing in this province and throughout this country a growing recognition of the interindependence of industrial worker and farmer, and I for one am very happy to see that develop. There has been just in the recent past, at the two conventions held recently, the Federation of Agriculture Convention on the one hand and the Federation of Labour Convention on the other, an exchange of labour and farm speakers, an attempt of organized labour to understand the problems of organized agriculture, and, in return, an attempt on the part of organized agriculture to appreciate the views of organized labour.

The hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) represented organized labour recently at a conference of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, and while it disturbed the editorial page of the Globe and Mail no end that he did, I think it disturbed the farmers much less. I think they were very pleased to think there might be some co-operation possible between labour and agriculture. And, as a delegate to the Ontario Federation of Labour Convention, I had the pleasure of listening to Mr. V. Milburn, Secretary of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, propose meetings and information about farmers' problems in this province. And I hope if there is any significance in that exchange of speakers, that it will develop and that we may expect to see a greater degree of co-operation between organized agriculture and organized labour in the future.

You know it is well that they might get together, because if there was ever evidence that they needed to get together, I think we had it in this morning's Globe and Mail. The headline referred to something about "A Packer paying One Cent a Pound more to the Farmer and City Consumers paying Ten Cents a Pound more for Beef". If that does not indicate they have a mutual enemy, I do not know what would indicate it. Both of them are being robbed by the packing corporations, and it is about time that labour and farmer recognize that they are both being "taken for a ride" by not only the packing corporations but by others -- a cent increase to farmers, says the Globe and Mail, and ten cents a pound increase to the city consumer, and most of the in-between going to the packing corporations.

That was not the whole story that the Globe and Mail told this morning, because they failed to even make mention of the fact that there are millions of pounds of beef in cold storage in this country. As a matter of fact I am told that the beef in cold storage as of February first this year was 11,352,000 pounds; there was fresh beef on hand of 8,157,000 pounds; or a total beef in storage, according to federal government statistics, of 19,509,000 pounds. I am quite sure that most of that beef was purchased from the farmers at the old, lower prices, but I am quite sure it is being sold to the consumers at the new, higher prices, and once again the packers will make a nice killing on inventory. And if the price resistance of consumers builds up enough that they will not buy beef in the butcher store, then it will be the farmer who will

have his prices lowered, at the stockyards, and again it will be the packing corporations that will come out protected. They have been doing it for years; certainly I am glad to see that labour and agriculture in this province are at long last getting together, and the sooner we get together, the sooner we will end this kind of thing.

You know, Canada Packers has been making money, in spite of the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown), who told us how badly off they were last year. The Canada Packers Corporation has been making money for a good many years. In 1937, the depreciation account of the Canada Packers Corporation was $9,000,000.; in 1937 they had a surplus reserve account of $6,000,000.; by 1949 that depreciation account was up to $19,000,000., and by the same time the surplus reserve account had jumped to $17,000,000. They had added $21,000,000. that way, and then, in addition, during the same period they paid out $10,000,000. in dividends -- this is the poor packing corporation --

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): I did not say they were not making money.

MR. PARK: A killing of $31,000,000., made out of the farmers and consumers of the province by one packing corporation, in the years 1937 to 1949. And that killing made on a 1928 investment of $1,438,000. That is a pretty nice return for your money -- $31,000,000. in that short period of time, and on that kind of investment.

That is not too bad, not too bad at all, but it should be remembered that, too, is private enterprise; that is the system, the economic system which the Conservative Party is

pledged to protect and to support; it is the economic system which the Liberal Party is pledged to protect and to support.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): And they do a pretty good job of it, too.

MR. PARK: And they do a pretty good job of it, too, as the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) says, and as the profit records of corporations in this country would clearly indicate.

It is not only in terms, of course, of beef prices that that sort of thing goes on. You can even see it in farm machinery. This is where both farmer and worker get rooked. I am quoting here, and I will give the source:

> "The U.S. Federal Trade Commission in a study revealed in September, 1945, showed that the labour costs in farm machinery ranged from only 5.9 percent. to a maximum of 14.6 percent. of the price the farmer pays for his machinery."

These are American figures and American prices, and, while they will not necessarily correspond, I think it is a fairly safe assumption that labour costs are pretty close in Canada.

> "As an example the F T C broke down the costs of a combine selling retail for $638. Labour costs were only $46.43, or 7.3 percent. of the price paid by the farmer.
>
> "Materials -- wood, steel, iron, fabric, rubber, et cetera -- cost $174.27. Counting the work of mining ore, cutting the timber,

"et cetera, plus the factory work, the labour cost was $221. This leaves $417. to be accounted for in factory overhead, manufacturer's and dealer's discount, -- "

And I suppose in the profits of the machinery manufacturers. With that kind of exploitation of farmer and labourer going on, it is little wonder that corporations like Massey-Harris Company could show profits of $9,000,000., little wonder at all -- and a profit by the way, which is 848 percent. higher than it was 10 years ago.

That is the private enterprise system too -- robbing the farmers as consumers when they sell them combines or farm machinery, robbing the workers and consumers and farmers as consumers when they sell them beef.

I do not expect to be able to convert this government to the need to do something to get rid of the private enterprise system, but I do say what I think is a practical suggestion for the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) and I hope he will take it under advisement.

I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) that there should be set up in this province a consumers' bureau. I make my suggestion to the hon. Minister of Agriculture(Mr. Kennedy) because he seems to be a man of considerable influence inthe government as witness that Bill we passed through here yesterday. I am quite sure the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) could not get a similar Bill through for workers. He seems to be a man of considerable influence and also, Mr. Speaker, a man who has a department which has a fair amount of money to spend and perhaps he can get this done. The Department

of Labour is pretty well strapped already, not having very much money and not doing too good a job with the money it has, but I think if the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) would undertake this proposal, it might be worthwhile. I would like to see him, in all seriousness, set up a kind of consumers' bureau.

Back in 1947 the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) did, I thought, a very excellent job when he revealed the information on the spread between what farmers get and what consumers pay for certain types of products. For instance, he gave us this information, which appeared in the Globe and Mail of December 23, 1947; he told us that when a consumer pays 25 to 27 cents for a tin of canned tomatoes, the farmer receives three and three-quarters cents for those canned tomatoes. He told us that when a consumer pays 23 to 25 cents for a tin of peas, the farmer is getting two and a half cents for those same peas. He told us about peaches, that when the consumer is paying 27 to 30 cents a tin for peaches, the farmer is receiving five and a half cents for peaches, and he gave us a lot of other information along a similar line. I would like to suggest to him that he should do that more often, and this consumers' bureau would be the kind of place where it could be done. I do not think you can stop these boys from profiteering by this kind of thing, but I do think you could throw a white light of publicity upon their profiteering, and perhaps slow them up a little, and I recommend that proposal to the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

I think we could do something more. I think a bureau like that could advise the consumers in the province as to

what Ontario-grown farm products are on the market at any given time, and help by that means to stimulate the domestic sale of farm products. I do not suggest that is any long-range solution to the marketing problem, but it is a small thing that a bureau could do, and, further than that, it could serve the farmers, I think, of the province by telling them something of the trend in consumer buying habits, so that they might adjust their crops and so on to meet that situation.

I think there is a three-fold proposal, that a consumers' bureau operating in the Department of Agriculture could perform, and I offer it gratis to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) and will never claim credit for it if he will go and do something about and do it quickly.

I could say several other things, Mr. Speaker, but my time is running out and there are many other speakers who want to be heard. I could mention the Department of Labour and say a few things about it, about the weaknesses of the inspection service which I think exist in the Department of Labour with respect to protecting workers in our plants. I could, perhaps, make mention of the attempts, just in the last twenty-four hours, of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to rescue the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) from the difficulties he has got himself into with respect to the labour code, when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has himself personally approached several of the labour leaders in the province to try and "square" them with some of the comments that were made about the labour code by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) outside the

House, but I think I will leave the hon. Minister of Labour and his Department to his estimates, and I will have something to say at that time about that.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by making this suggestion to the House: I think there are signs of economic difficulty ahead, and I think all of us on all sides of the House recognize those signs of economic difficulty, and as we approach that time I regret that we approach it in a situation where the control of our economic life is in the hands of relatively few people.

It hardly matters in what field of endeavour we may attempt to mend our economic situation, we find the economics of our country in the control of a very few people, -- two corporations doing 85 percent. of the packing house business. I spoke a little while ago about the profits of Canada Packers; we do not know anything about the profits of the Swift Canadian Company, they do not even do us the courtesy of letting us know what they are, and whenever they get in labour disputes, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) runs off, cap in hand, to Chicago, to meet with the management down there, because they will not come and recognize the province of Ontario as a government with which they should do business at the seat of government.

Two corporations do 85 percent. of the packing house business. Two firms control 83 percent. of the fruit and vegetable canning business, -- some of that information I was spreading on the record a few minutes ago. Five corporations producing 73 percent. of the flour milled in this country. Little wonder the Price of Bread Commission can reveal the figures to us.

We talk of houses, one company controls 86 percent. of the cement produced in this country; three companies dominate the mail industry in this country; four companies control 88 percent. of the electrical equipment and supplies in this country.

That is the picture at every phase of our economic life, a few people are controlling our economic destinies, and we, as long as the government is prepared to accept the philosophy of private enterprise, as long as the government is prepared to accept the theory of the capitalistic system that profits come first and people come second, then I say we are going to have increasing difficulties, and these these signs of economic drift which are here now will continue in the future.

For my part -- and I think I join with a great many others -- people are worried about what is coming to us, but for my part, I do not think we are going to get a settlement of this problem of insecurity in this country until we get rid of the capitalistic system.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, as it is the usual custom in speaking at the first opportunity during a Session to convey one's good wishes to Mr. Speaker and newly-elected hon. members of the government, as well as the mover and the seconder, I am sure I would like to go on record as conveying to the hon. Speaker of the House my best wishes and respects regarding the manner in which he is fulfilling the duties of that office, and to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) who has sat his first Session as Premier of the Province of Ontario,

and also to convey to him my very best wishes, as personally a very warm feeling of friendship has existed between Mrs. McEwing and myself and the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) and his good lady, and I hope nothing would mar that, regardless of our political differences.

I wish to congratulate my neighbour, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Hamilton) on his elevation to the seat of government as a Cabinet Minister. Wellington is able from time to time to keep on the map of recognition in this manner. I think in years gone by it has been recognized in the same way.

May I also extend congratulations to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) upon his first speech in the House. He certainly did a very good job. I did not intend to mention this part, but it has been touched upon this afternoon. I remember well an instant in a social event where everybody were supposed to have their work well in hand, and the chief official read his whole address from beginning to end, much to the amazement of many of the people, and the visiting chief officer was passing remarks upon it, and she said: "It was well read, anyway". I would say that certainly, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) did that.

In speaking of reading speeches, I am not condemning the practice, and I am not condoning it, but I still remember only a few years ago the then leader of the Conservative Party which was in opposition at that time, the hon. Leopold MacAulay, who raised objections at every opportunity and would not allow hon. members of the House to read any speeches. It became quite regular during that

time to check anybody who attempted to read a speech. That was the policy of the Conservative Party at that time.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): What is Leo doing now?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Bad as Angus Dickson, would you say?

Angus Dickson read a speech.

MR. McEWING: Yes.

MR. DUNBAR: That is what you are referring to.

MR. McEWING: A little leader -- a little later --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. McEWING: Well, he was a big leader, and he was a little one too. The hon. George Drew, he read them all.

AN hon. MEMBER: He even learned to read.

MR. McEWING: And the people on that side of the House applauded that he did.

And I can think of another instance which came to my attention when the hon. leader of the party at that time, the hon. Mr. Drew, was condemning Ottawa so badly, the party was applauding him all the time -- he was doing the right thing. And then when the hon. Mr. Frost came in as Premier, and, sensibly I say, and I think he is doing the right thing in co-operating with Ottawa -- the party cheers him, and says he is doing the right thing.

AN hon. MEMBER: Charlie McCarthys.

MR. McLEOD: Right or wrong --

MR. McEWING: Yes, right or wrong, the leader is my party, the leader is my policy, and we will have to make some allowance for that.

The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) in speaking -- and I congratulate him on his first speech -- said he was not a partisan man. I do not know just what one would be, he gave a speech that was partisan.

Before I pass, though, I do not want to omit mention of the hon. member for North Cochrane (Mr. Leger). In his first attempt in the House he gave a very splendid address and while I did not agree with everything he said, nevertheless I think he will make a worthwhile contribution toward the debates in this House.

I am glad to see new hon. members come in who are willing to take part, and I am not critical whether they read their speeches or not, because there are times, particularly since we have Hansard, that it is very difficult. My hon. leader (Mr. Oliver) here found that out the other day.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Have you got a leader, too?

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): You tried once, you know.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: You did better than I did.

MR. McEWING: But I think it is necessary to be fairly correct. However, I must say that I am not very good at reading speeches myself, so I will not attempt to do so, and we will just have to accept it as it is, and I think the House will allow it and, as far as I am concerned, I think it is perfectly all right.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak mainly today on matters affecting agriculture. I represent a riding which is almost purely agricultural. When I am thinking of

rural and urban centres, any urban centre that has under a thousand or two thousand of a population is practically rural, their relationship and their influences are so closely bound together that there is practically no difference in the needs of either. For that reason I am going to stick fairly closely to agriculture. I may branch off a little, but there are a number of other speakers who will deal well with the different departments, so the rest of the hon. Ministers need not worry very much, they can sit back at ease.

I am sorry the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is not here, for I do not like passing remarks about his department in his absence.

(Take E-1 follows)

However, it is not my responsibility he is not here.

MR. PORTER: We will pass it on.

MR. OLIVER: Let us hope he understands it.

MR. PORTER: Whatever you do, do not read that.

MR. McEWING: Now that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) has spoken--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. McEWING: I will just deal with something on education which has a relationship to the people. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) announced a policy quite recently regarding grades in the schools, teaching standards, which I just cannot agree with. In the first place, he has taken a little leaf or two out of the Hope Report, I believe, and heis going to--

MR. NIXON: What report is that?

MR. McEWING: Well, it is coming.

MR. PORTER: How do you know?

MR. McEWING: I am not sure.

MR. NIXON: How do you know it is coming?

MR. McEWING: There is something in it, I believe, to the effect that there is going to be a scarcity of teachers and they will lower the standard so they can have more teachers. It seems to me he removes the standards, the old, established standards that were set for examinations. Now, these things are debatable, I will admit that, but there is something about these examinations, the departmental examinations which were set by the department, sent down to the schools, so all the schools had the same standard of examination. Now, it is apparently going to be left to the teachers to make their own standards and what is going to be the result when they get up to grade 13 and further on and want to go to university? There is no yardstick that is uniform, that all these pupils will pass. Trying examinations of

that type, it is going to be deterimental to them when they get to university. I think they are going to find that it is going to be a rather serious thing. You lower the standards of the teachers, you allow them to have their own standard of examinations, of tests, or whatever you may like, and the result is there is no uniformity across the board at all.

The other thing that is disappointing to us in the agricultural areas---they are finding it intheir tax bill---is the fact that the government promised that they were going to pay 50% of the school tax burden and practically every farmer when he looks at his tax bill finds it is doubled and sometimes tripled. Not only that, but gone with it is the local autonomy in the school community. It would not be so bad if they divided up the authority according to what they paidbut that local section has a lot to pay, twice and sometimes three times asmuch as before and about one-third as much to say or less. On the next move, I presume they will not have anything to say. It is getting to be so that the local people have very little interest in the schools. I have been all for some of the vocational training but in the primary education I think it isa mistake to take these children away from home for long hours as they are doing now, and facing the risks that theyare facing. There are many dangers they are facing with the busses they are being transported in and on this point I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to take note and I wouldlike him to change his Highway Act in this regard, that every school bus inwhich pupils are being transported with which wehave had a number of accidents, every school bus should be labelled onthe rear of the bus and no vehicle, whether it be a car or truck, should be allowed to pass a bus that is standing allowing pupils to leave. Children will get out and their home is across the road and they make a dash and along comes a car and we have had a number of

accidents of that kind. I think something could be done in that regard and I am trying to make a constructive suggestion there. I hope there is something done about it.

Again, I say the local people do want something to say about their schools. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has done some things that I would like to commend him for. He gave increased grants to community halls but we asked for them repeatedly and I appreciate that he did it. I think the records will show that the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) has asked during the debates here that this be done for years, and I think it means a great deal to these communities. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Pryde) and myself had the pleasure the other evening of opening up a community hall. I see someone has put a picture of this on my desk just now. It is a very fine thing for a community.

We are going to train their junior farmers and encourage them and what the Department of Agriculture has done in that regard is certainly worth while. We are going to train these youths to take part intheir local community but the sad part of it all is we are training them up to it and what form of government arethey going to have any chance to do it in? There is very little they are going to have to do in local councils or to say about how they spend their money. The Department has practically all to say about it. I would not be a bit surprised in the very near future we will have no township council at all and we will have a lot of youth trained to take these positions and fulfill these duties in a very efficient manner and there will be no school boards, there will be no township councils. I suppose they will all want to run for Members of Parliament as that is the only thing they can get. However, that training is worth while for these young men, young folk who came back and it has been very necessary since the war because there were many of

these boys who fought for a better place to live in and they came home with the ideaof putting into action some of the things they wanted. The junior farmers is a good thing, a splendid opportunity to express themselves to take part in their local community and I think it is well worth while.

On the other hand, I have been trying to figure out just what the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) has done for the farmers. Personally, I think a lot of thehon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy), he is a fine citizen but there are some things that have happened lately that the farmers of Ontario are not too well pleased about. The hog subsidy and the cheese subsidy were discontinued at a time that was very critical, at a time that food was high and the competition in the Europenn market was at stake and the ability to buy was at a crucial stage. The first move that was made inthe decline of prices was for the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) to take off the premium on bacon which was keeping our standard up to compete in the Danish market and on cheese also and the farmers of the province of Ontario are not very pleased about it. Right now, the hog producers are asking the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to fulfill a promise that he made some time ago on allowing them to take two cents a hog for organization work---pardon me, I meant the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy). They are asking for an increase for that and he has so far refused to grant it. I have been a little disappointed in the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) promise in regard to farmers because he definitely promised me on the floor of the House here regarding the discontinuing of the hog subsidy---- pardon me, I mean the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) who was Premier at that time. I have the connection there that seems to be hard to get away from.

MR. NIXON: So many of them.

MR. DUNBAR: That was kind of a habit in the past in Ontario.

MR. PORTER: We have a precedent.

MR. McEWING: Another thing this government did was to permit in law the sale of oleomargarine in the province of Ontario which the farmers in Ontario are not too well pleased about. There is a tremendous amount of margarine being manufactured and some will say it is not hurting the butter producer. I have heard that report but it cannot help but hurt me. In that regulation, if I remember rightly, when that Bill was passing the House, in a matter of coloring the package, it was stated quite plainly that the color would not be contained in the package, that it would be in the capsule separate. Today we have it right in itin a nice cellophane package that you just work your hand a little bit and you have it colored.

MR. SALSBERG: I told you a year ago.

MR. McEWING: There is one thing I do feel that the dairy and butter industry is missing and that is to put on a campaign of advertising in the same manner as the manufacturers of oleomargarine. They present an article good in appearance and advertise it. A man was telling me today how it was advertised on the inside of a cover for a milk bottle so when you took it off, all you had to do was to read about margarine. Now, I claim this product is hurting the butter industry inthe province of Ontario and here a e the figures of the domestic consumption from the Bureau of Statistics at Ottawa. The consumption in November, 1947, was 322,310,000 pounds; the consumption in 1948---this had not come into effect yet but it shows how the growth of the consumption was---337,260,000 pounds, but then inthe same period in 1949 the consumption is 299,463,000 pounds. With the amount that margarine is manufacturing itis going somewhere and it is damaging the dairy industry inthe province of Ontario.

MR. G. G. JOHNSTON (Simcoe Centre): Would thehon.member (Mr. McEwing) permit a question?

MR. McEWING: Yes.

MR. JOHNSTON: I realize the hon.member for Wellington North(Mr. McEwing) represents a dairy constitutency such as I, but after all, if you will recall, the Dominion government received the decision of the Supreme Court and they are the people who did not have the courtesy to call in the various Miniters of Agriculture through all the provinces of Canada in order to discuss the regulations as to the sale of it.

MR.NIXON: Where is the question?

MR. JOHNSTON: I am asking him does he recall it?

MR. McEWING: I recall that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) in the province of Ontario did not take the same steps as the hon.Minister of Agriculture in Quebec did to deal with the situation.

MR. JOHNSTON: Canada Packers were producing it six days after it was announced.

MR. McEWING: Another thing I rather object to which this government did and which penalized the farmers of the province of Ontario and it has to do with hydro. The farmers who are attempting, when their boys came and labor was available, to do some of the work that they planned to do during the war and what did they find last year? They found that they went to buy some cement and materials and there were not any available. They could buy some American cement provided they paid a high enough price. I donot know what you call it---a bootleg price or whatever you call it, but it was about three times the price we should pay for cement. Now, I claim this government with its Department of Hydro had, I understand, about 90% of the Canadian cement last year. Am I right in that figure?

HON. G.CHALLIES(Minister without Portfolio): I could not tell you but I can inform you that we purchased 190,000 barrels in Europe as well as another 98,000 barrels in order to make cement available

for people in Ontario.

MR. MILLARD: Free enterprise was not doing a very good job then.

MR.McEWING: I understand that you did buy that but it would have been a much better thing if you had bought a great deal more and allowed the home builders and the farmers and the veterans who wanted a few bags here and there to have it. Some of them were getting a house half built and then having to wait for a few bags of cement. I claim this government failed the people of the province of Ontario whenthey allowed that to happen.

SOME hon.MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. McEWING: It was a serious situation.

MR. CHALLIES: It was not serious.

MR. McEWING: The hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) will give you the exact figures of what was carried for domestic use outside of that and it was a tremendous tax that these people paid.

Now, another thing that is bothering the farmers in the province of Ontario, and that is the matter of freight rates. Now, the railways made application for an increase in freight rates and seven provinces out of the Dominion joined together and employed the best legal talent available and opposed it but not the province of Ontario. The province of Ontario did not raise a hand against it, I do not know whether there was any reason behind it, the relationship of the government to the C. P. R. or any other railroad, I do not know, but they did not do it. Now, they got an increase and they thought it was going to tide them over but what happens? Just as soon as the railway got an increase, along comeslabor, organized labor. Now, it was estimated and I have the figures here somewhere if you will allow me to read a little of this.

MR. DOUCETT: That is a good idea.

MR. McEWING: It was estimated that this increase they got would net them about $81,000,000 for the railways of the Dominion of Canada and then the organized labor comes along and says, "We want an increase of wages," so they got an increase of, I understand, 17¢ an hour and out of that $81,000,000, it took $80,000,000 to pay that.

MR. MacLEOD: Never satisfy the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley).

MR. McEWING: Now they are going around in a circle. The railway is asking for another increase and I will bet you labor will ask for another increase of wages.

MR. CHALLIES: That will help the farmer.

MR. SALSBERG: It will pay for the higher peace price.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. McEWING: That is where the farmers inthe province of Ontario and others in this province are, in the sticks. I believe the hon. member for York was down to a meeting at St. Catharines and extended goodwill and expressed a desire to cooperate with agriculture and I think he is sincere. However, I have a feeling that to cooperate we are supposed to stay right up where they are or get up no matter whether we sell our products or whether we find an outlet for them. Here is what a former Member of Parliament fromthe West said:

> "The unionsseem to have it in their power to enforce whatever wage demandstey choose to make regardless of the service or the suffering their actions might inflict on others. There must be something wrong with laws and practices which enable one group of private citizens, responsible to no one but themselves, to hold all the people of Canada as a hostage for the purpose of one group."

That is true of all groups, not just one.

MR. MacLEOD: Who said that?

MR. McEWING: Mr. Young, a farmer in Western Canada.

MR. MacLEOD: He is a Liberal.

MR. McEWING: We can look across the line to the United States to see John L. Lewis holding up practically the whole nation today. While there are leaders of industry that are being blamed for exploiting labor, we have leaders of labor that are exploiting industry, it is working that way and it has come to a point that it is just as serious that way asthe other way. You may not agree with me.

MR. MacLEOD: The Supreme Court gave a clean bill of health to it.

MR. McEWING: I think if labor is prepared to join with agriculture, they have to realize that the product of their labors and the product of our labors have to compete in world markets and if we have to go down in price to compete in world markets, we have to lower our standards a little to do it, we have to expect a little less and labor has to expect a little less. They are not prepared to do that right at the time when we expect and I think the last speaker covered this, not only are we at a point where there is a change right at that point, they are asking for more money and shorter hours. Their belief is they can do as much work in shorter hours as they did inthe former 48 hours. I cannot agree with that. While I am not saying there might be particular instances where a man may be tied to a production line where it gets a little wearisome, but there are some thingshappening and we do not have to go 100 miles from here to see them happen. All you have to do is to stand down the hall here at 10 o'clock in the morning and see what is happening. They are not giving entirely the same services for the shorter hours that they did in the hours previous.

I will give you an example. Two years ago I required a part

for a binder and I ordered it early in the season so I would have it but it did not come. The season was on in which to use it and I got after the dealer and he inturn said: "I will get after the block man, he will be here tomorrow." He got after the block man and here is the block man's story. This is a plant in Brantford---I will have to get my good friend the hon. member for Brantfod (Mr. Gordon) to look into this---they had previously 375 men employed in that plant, two years before, and at this time they had 650 men employed and with allthe modern machinery and conveniences they were not producing as much as the 375 men produced before, with their 650 men. They say they can do more work in shorter hours but it just does not go.

MR. MILLARD: I wonder if the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) would be good enough to give me the name of that company. I would like to look into that matter.

MR. McEWING: Yes, it was Massey-Harris, Brantford, manufacturing binders.

MR. DUNBAR: Be careful.

MR. McEWING: Now, that is one.

MR. SILSBERG: The company that made $9,000,000 last year.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. McEWING: I am not saying they made excess profits last year because I think we farmers made enough to pay our share of it. I am not saying they did, but I am saying that if we are going to level off I would like the leaders of agriculture, the leaders of labor, the leaders of industry, and the leaders of finance to sit down together and work this thing out. If we have to go down the scale we should go down together. We in this country should do our best to make Canada a good country and to work together, but when one group says, "We are going to stay up here, regardless," it is not going to get any cooperation from the others.

Now, I see the time is hurrying along and I have one thing

I would like to deal withtoday and I do not want to miss it. Just for the moment, I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) to a point that was suggested before and that is, I would like him to do something about restricting the size of loads and weight ofloads that are travelling on our highways. It seems to me, the bigger bridges we build, the bigger trucks they build and the bigger roads we build, the bigger the trucks and they are tearing our roads down and we cannot keep up to them. I think there has got to be some restriction and I think it is timewe got together and did something. We can hardly have a telephone line across the road without having it torn down, the loads are so high. I think thehon.Minister (Mr. Doucett) should consider this seriously.

Another thing, in our district we have a packing plant in Kitchener and nearly all our livestock in the north end of Wellington goes to Kitchener. We would like a road there from No. 6 and No. 9 to connect withthe highway at Elmira so there would be an outlet there.

MR. DOUCETT: To take the pigs in orthe trucks?

MR. McEWING: There is a tremendous amount of stuff going in there and the people of Kitchener and Waterloo are requesting anoutlet because a great many of them are living in the summer time at Georgian Bay. I think it is something we have not been undly urgent about because we realized there were a great many things to do after the war, but with the spending program you have I think we have waited long enough, we are entitled to something in that respectand I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) to consider this matter.

There is one more thing I do want to deal with. I am going to skip one or two things which are not so important, but this is important and it concerns the rural people of Ontario and that is our rural telephone situation in the province of Ontario.

Since the Bell Telephone Company hasmade application to the Transport Board for an increase in rates, it has brought this thing to a head and it has placed us in a very serious situation. I doubt if there are many hon.members in this House who are vitally interested in this rural telephone situation but it is necessary, it is a necessity for the people of rural Ontario. Hydro is practically a necessity and so is the telephone a necessity to rural Ontario. I would like to point out to thehon. members of the House the situation which we are in now and it is a serious situation. If nothing is done it is going to result in the collapse of a lot of our rural telephone systems. You may not realize that. The Bell Telephone Company made this application to the Transport Board and the hearing was supposed to be in December. The Bell Telephone Company is a well organized company, they are able to employ the very best officials, the very best legal talents and present their case in the very bestpossible way and they are skillful about it. They were months preparing this application and suddenly they made applicationand requested that it be heard right away and that it become effective the 1st of December. The brief was sent out, or the application was sent out to nearly all the companies, the independent companies, and it was so timed that there was no opportunity to do anything and they just threw up their hands, they were so bewildered.

(Take F follows)

and they felt that the time was so short there was no time to do anything. They were bewildered. There are some of us who will not go down without fighting, and we made a stand. We got the proper contact at Ottawa, and appealed to the proper officials and asked for a postponement, and got a delay of the hearing. Instead of it being last fall, it will now be the 8th of March, next Wednesday, I believe.

They represent about 570 telephone companies in Ontario. They employed the hon. Mr. Roebuck as their solicitor. Quebec employed the hon. "Chubby" Powers as their solicitor, and they are preparing a brief to present on behalf of the telephone situation. Unfortunately, we have two classes of telephone companies, principally in Ontario, half of them, more or less, without switching arrangement if there is an increase, because they have there no switching service. The other half -- I can give you the exact number -- have a switching arrangement with the Bell, and the rate the Bell is taxing on them is a squeeze, and will put them out of business. They have no chance of getting on without that promised increase.

How do the telephone companies get in that situation? Undoubtedly the hon. members will remember -- and I can take the book here on telephone arrangements in 1949 -- a great many of these companies were organized from 1905 to 1920. I can say eighty per cent were organized during that time, and the basis on which they built up, the costs were lower and the rates were lower. How were these rates set? What was the yardstick that was used to set these rates?

After the companies made an application for an increase in rates there was a hearing of the board, and they heard that the Bell would give good service, and so on, and they set the rate according to that. The Bell went out on a competitive price which was not based on the cost of telephones at all. They went out again to compete with some companies in these little places and the price was such that part of the costs had to be carried by the main company. That was not fair. It was all right while things went smoothly, but we have got to a state where the lines have deteriorated, and the costs are higher, and the companies are going to collapse. Here is the Bell asking for switching donations at $6,80 for each telephone.

It is impossible for these companies, in the circumstances, to ask it from their subscribers. In the first place, a great many of these companies are not in good shape to give one hundred per cent service. Where are they going to get the money to do that? The rate they have had all along did not allow for a reserve fund to build a line again, and here they find themselves without any money. The result is, they will throw up their hands. Here is a case of it in my own riding, and this happened since the increase made on rates, and I quote:

> "Rural Phone Line to Cease Service -- Rising Operation Costs Said Cause of ecision
>
> After over 40 years of continuous service the Rockwood and Oustic Telephone Company is being forced to suspend service to its 81 subscribers. This w s the inform tion conveyed by directors of the private telephone company to an emergency meeting of Eramosa Township Council in Rockwood yesterday.

The company finds it impossible to carry on because of the increasing cost of operation. A meeting of subscribers and others interested is being held February 25, in the Rockwood Town Hall, at 2 o'clock, to determine what is to be done. Action is necessary if phone service is to be continued in that area, since the Bell Telephone Company has advised that it cannot furnish service there for at least three years."

This company, the directors and officers, went to their legal advisor and he said, "You cannot get your charter back until you take your telephones out and your lines down". They said, "All right. We will leave it. We will not have anything more to do with it.

There are no teeth in our Act.

(Take G follows)

but the local people had made an attempt, under the Telephone Act, to try and operate under---I think it is Act 2 of the Telephone Companies---under the municipal set-up. They went to the Bell and the Bell said: "We cannot do anything for you for three years; we cannot t uch you for three years; we have so much ahead of you." But what will they do between now and three years from now?

They called a meeting of the council---and this is typical of what is going to happen all over the province in situations like that; I am in one myself, and I know what it is like---they went to the council, and the council could appoi t a commission to take over the telephone company provided these subscribers would sign a contract which is really a lien on their farms. Whether they sell it or not, it is a still a lien on the farms ---and will be for three years.

They went to some of the farmers, and the farmers said: "You cantake the thing out, I am not signing any three-year contract." There was no mentionmade of the rate. The Act says "Whatever rate the commission wishes to charge."

There is an example of what goes on in many, many telephone companies. These companies are not making money. For example, let me read two or three reports here. Maybe some of the hon. members will recognize the companies.

Here is a telephone company at Sutherland. The revenue last year was $6027---there were 331 telephones---and their expenditure was $8319. How long can theygo on that way?

Here is the Udney Telephone Company. The revenue was $1877, and their expenditures were $2679.

Here is our own company. Our revenuewas $6090 and our expenditures were $6880. This past year we had a profit of $14, thank goodness.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how long can those companies continue to

exist? We had a co pany right close to us went to the Bell Telephone Company, since this rate increase, and they said: "We will give you our company for $1," and the Bell Company said: "We do not want it; we cannot handle it; you have no staff and no servicemen." If that is the case, that the Bell would not touch it even for one dollar, and they would not touch the Rockwood one for three years, what will happen to the telephone service in our province, in the next three years?

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Would you be in favor of nationalizing the telephone service?

MR. McEWING: No, I would not be in favor of nationalizing the telephone service. These companies started out as a community affair, just to give service for the few. The thing spread, and they could not refuse, but they have got to the point now where they cannot expand. Who will put the money into it? Just consider our own little company. For seven years we have not had any interest at all. How canwe induce people to put money into that company? We could put 100 phones in, in the next two weeks, if we had them.

I think the people of the province of Ontario are entitled to a telephone service. If the province of Manitoba can make a success of the telephone service, why cannot the province of Ontario?

SOME hon.MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. McEWING: I think it is the duty of this government to look into this thing. We have the Bell Telephone Company, which is a splendid company, and I would not say that it is necessary tonationalize it. I think the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) told us the other day they are making about 8%. Well, that is a lot better than we get. I do not say that statement is exactly correct---but we cannot compete with them. We are in the squeeze, and we justsit there, and cannot do a thing

about it.

I think the province of Ontario can save the telephone situation for the rural people. I am no speaking about s ving it for our own company, but I think something can be done to bring about a betterment of this situation, and I would like it if the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) would think of these things seriously.

There are many other angles I would have liked to explain to show the necessity for it. For instance, let us consider our Lands and Forests Department---and I see the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) is here---I believe that department has seven thousand and some miles of telephone wires for that department. I do not know whether the hon. Vice-Chairman of the Hydro (Mr. Challies) can tell me how many mil s they have of telephone service.

HON. MR. CHALLIES (Minister Witho t Portfolio): No, I will have to look it up.

MR. McEWING: The thing is this. We drive down a road, and we see there four sets of poles. Is there any sense inthat? I think the hydro poles can contain the wires of both, and they do in many cases. I think these poles along the roads are a menace to the highways and a danger to life, because every time there is a storm down comes some poles and we do not know who will be damaged and hurt in the storm. These thingsare certainly not safe.

The hydro is following the policy of getting off onto private property, and I think it is a good policy and I think we might establish in these areas in which these switching companies are in trouble, a system whereby we can take over and serve those people and I think they will give us good service and it will be appreciated in the same manner as is hydro. It will be a public utility in the same manner as is hydro, with the same

services to service it. I think that will simplify the whole thing. I am not s ying we should nationalize the whole thing any more than you did when you started hydro. I think a little competition would be a good thing to have the Bell in there, as far as that goes, because they have a national hook-up all over the Dominion.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I intend shortly to table a resolution asking the government to take some action in this matter. This is a serious situation, and it will meam a lot to the people of Ontario. It is the service for these people of which I am thinking. It is not a matter of saving dollars for the shareholders, because we started this thing to meet the services of the people, but we drifted into something we did not want. But we do want the people to have that service---and I am speaking for the people in Ontrrio who live on the concessions, inthe rural parts. We have the hydro poles along those concessions, let us give them the telephone service, too.

MR. CHALLIES: I presume youare thinking of hydro running a telephone system?

MR. McEWING: No, not necessarily.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER(Grey South): No, you have all you can do,

MR. CHALLIES: I thought you might want us to go into the cement business, too.

MR. McEWING: No, I am not suggesting that.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Would you suggest in view of the situation, that we look over it, and would you want us to take over all these defunct companies, with all their old equipment, which is worn out and which you say has been in there since 1905, or is it your idea that we start over with new quipment and an entirely new set-up?

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): You take over the defunct

ones and leave the others to the Bell.

MR. McEWING: If you are not being charged for them, you can afford to take them over. That is, the companies of which I have spoken. We have put in 100 new telephones in the last ten years, and we built fifteen miles of line last year. That is not old and defunct.

MR. DUNBAR: Some of them are. Mr. Speaker, what was the remark by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard)? I did not get it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) was out of order.

MR. T. PRYDE (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I say that tomorrow, being Friday, we will meet at 2 o'clock as announced, and proceed with government orders, and if possible, will carry on this debate, with a couple of speeches, and we will adjourn at 4.30.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.02 o'clock p. m.

- - - -

Volume 12.

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS THIRD DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P. M.

Toronto, Ontario
Friday, March 3, 1950
2.00 o'clock, p. m.

2.00 O'CLOCK, P. M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled,"An Act to amend the Agricultural Societies Act, 1939," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides that grants may be made to a society for capital improvements out of such monies as may be appropriated by the Legislature for the purpose. The section also limits the amount of such grants.

There is another complementary section, an amendment to the first section.

MILK CONTROL ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Milk Control Act," and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, in the first place, provides for procedure upon application for the establishment of milk marketing agencies. It is changed somewhat from the existing procedure. Hereafter, an appeal of the producers supplying milk to a community to be taken, required least 66% must petition for such application before the Board can recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to grant the application.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) may, upon application of the producers supplying milk to the market, if he is of the opinion that the association represents 75%, grant permision for them to pay a fee to met the expenses of the association.

That is in the existing section. By the amendment, the association must represent at least 66% of the petitioners supplying milk, instead of 75%, as now.

Thirdly, there is a new section designed to control the distribution of milk in competitive areas, to prevent marketing disputes.

Fourthly, there is power to make regulations in respect to that, and an amendment, complementary to section 3 of this Bill. That is the administrative section.

Also, there is power in the Board to make regulations providing for an inspection of the books and records of licensed producers and distributors by an independent auditor.

THE MARRIAGE ACT

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Hamilton, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "The Marriage Act, 1950," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister explain the Bill, please.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a consolidation and revision of the Marriage Act, the last complete revision of which was in 1921.

Two new principles are contained in the Bill, but generally the purpose of the revision is for clarification and simplification of the existing principles.

The new principles embodied are as follows:

"Authority to solemnize marriage is given to the judges of the county and district courts and to magistrates.

"The registration of clergymen provision of the Act is broadened to include clergymen of undenominational

groups by changing the words 'religious denomination' to 'religious body.'

"Henceforth marriages cannot be solemnized under the authority of publication of banns, unless the banns are called ina church or churches where parties to the marriage are i a habit of attending worship regularly.

"Provision ismade whereby a married persnn who is unable to prove the death of a missing spousemay apply to a judge of the county or district court for an order that for the purpose of obtaining a marriage license or special permit, or of being married under the authority of publication of banns, the missing spouse shall be presumd dead."

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 16, 11, 4 and 20.

Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to make a statement to the House with reference to the fuel situation in Ontario and the present situation as regards any controls which either are or may be in connection with that problem.

The fuel situation arisng from the strike in the American coal fields has been receiving attention for some time past.

Mr. A..R. Crozier of the Department of Mines has been in Ottawa in consultationwiththe Fuel Board and t e situation has been thoroughly canvassed. On January 23, 1948 at the time of the crisis and shortage in c nnectionwith natural and manufactured gas, Mr. Crozier was appointed as Fuel Controller within the meaning of the Fuel Supply Act, Chap. 53 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario. This appointment is still in effect. The Fuel Supply Act gives the controller wide powers of control and aoso provides for the enforcement of any regulations made by the Fuel Controller

of Canada. Pursuant to this, Mr. Crozier was directed to collaborate to the fullest extent with the Dominion authorities in thepresent situationand, asstated, hasbeen in Ottawa in consultation withthe authorities there.

Mr. Crozier hashad great experience in fuel matters and is on the Interprovincial Committee concerning fuel supply upon which are representatives of the fuel producing provinces, - British Columbia, Alberta and Nova Scotia, as well as some other provinces. This Committee was formed in 1948 with a view to encouraging the use of Canadian coal in the central provinces. We in Ontario were particularly interested from our standpoint.

In Ontario, any effective control must call for the co-operation of municipal authorities and fuel dealers and distribution agencies. Already in many municipalities, and with fuel dealers generally, there is a fairly effective control.

It is felt desirable, however, in thepresent situation to request that the heads of all municipalities should call intthe fuel dealers and distribution agencies and inventory supplies on hand and limit deliveries in the best way under all circumstances to meet the needs of the people. If situations arise which cannot be taken careof locally, heads of municipalities or dealers and distributors should get in touch at once with the Fuel Cohtroller who has wide powers under the Act which I have mentioned.

Industry, institutions of all kinds and private individuals can best help at this time by conserving supplies of hand in every way and using substitutes for coal where possible. In use of substitutes, however, it is necessary that there should be a conservation of natural and artificial gas, particularly inthe Dominion Natural Gas Company area. It must be borne in mind that natural gas is very largely being supplemented by products of oil which are being held up by transportation difficulties caused by the coal strike, and therefore conservation of gas is very desirable. The

Fuel Controller has already made arrangements as between the Union and Dominion gas companies to supplement the Dominion supply by an addition two million cubic feet per day. It is hoped that rationing of industry in the Dominion area may be avoided but this can be helped by all persons in that area conserving gas to the best of their ability.

This afternoon a conference is already in progress between Mr. Crozier, the Fuel Controller, and Mr.Ian McLaren of the Dominion Coal Board. The Controller is also continuously in touch with Mr. Uren, the Chairman of the Dominion Board. The Fuel Controller is prepared at any time to exercise such powers under the Act as may be necessary to insure the best use of the supplies of fuel in Ontario. Inthe meantime, however, the best co-operation that can be given is, as stated, to avoid panic buying, hoarding and things of that sort. The best results can be produced by common sense, co-operative efforts on the part of industry, institutions of all kinds, consumers and the governmental authorities.

In connection with "governmental authority" we have, for some days past, been in close touch with the Dominion authorities, with Mr. Uren, with the Dominion Coal Board and the Fuel Board, and this morning I had two or three chaps on the telephone with the Mayors of Hamilton and Toronto, and I have been in touch with the Mayors of some other municipalities, and I would say that there is the closest co-operation betweenthe various levels of government, and I am quite satisfied if there is---as I feel there will be---a common-sense approach to this matter on the part of industry, our institutions and the people, the situation can be overcome in satisfactory manner.

In conversation with one of the Mayors this morning, he told me they were experiencing some difficulty with people who had a reasonable amount of fuel, but wanted to protect themselves

by getting a little more. I know it is human nature to do things of that sort, but, after all, it is getting late in the season---today is the 3rd of March---and if we have anything approaching normal weather, with a common-sense approach to the matter on the part of all our people, we should not have any difficulty.

It is quite apparent that the present situation may become extremely serious and it is a wise and proper precaution for everyone to conserve in every way at the present time. Panic buying of any kind must not be permitted and fuel dealers and purchasers are asked to govern themselves accordingly.

In the meantime, everything possible is being done in co-operation withthe Federal authorities to supplement Ontario fuel supplies from Canadian sources.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) whether the province doesnot contemplate making an independent arrangement for the securing of coal fromthe Nova Scotia fields and from Alberta? It may be that this is as good a time as any to lay the basis for a continuous flow of coal from these Canadian fields to the central part of the country.

In view of the crisis, I think there would be great justification in making such an arrangement at this time.

MR. FROST: All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that in this we are acting in partnership with the other governments, with the Federal government, and the closest relationship with the coal producing provinces, through the Fuel Committee, and anything we can do to further the use of Canadian fuel, we will do. On the other hand, in this province, we will not take advantage of the crisis to place other provinces, and industries of other provihces, at a disadvantage. We are trying to work in close co-operation with the other authorities.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker,

I beg to present the 30th report of the Department of Labor of the Province of Ontario, for the fiscal year ended the 31st of March, 1949.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 1.

THE AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 1st order, third reading of Bill number 41, "An Act to amend the Agricultural Associations Act," Mr. Kennedy.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I move third reading of Bill No. 41. "An Act to amend the Agricultural Associations Act,"

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled asin the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 2.

THE FARM PRODUCTS GRADES AND SALES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 2nd Order, third reading of Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend the Farm Products Grades and Sales Act," Mr. Kennedy.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend the Farm Products Grades and Sales Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 3.

LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 3rd Order, third reading of Bill number 43, "An Act respecting Livestock and Livestock Products," Mr. Kennedy.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in the

absence of Mr. Kennedy I beg to move third reading of Bill number 43, "An Act respecting Livestock and Livestock Products."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 4.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT, 1946

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 4th Order, third reading of Bill number 44, "An Act to amend the Farm Products Marketing Act, 1946," Mr. Kennedy.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy I beg to move third reading of Bill number 44, "An Act to amend the Farm Products Marketing Act, 1946."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 5.

THE STALLIONS ACT, 1950

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 5th Order, third reading of Bill number 45, "The Stallions Act, 1950," Mr. Kennedy.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I beg to move third reading of Bill number 45, "The Stallions Act, 1950."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 6.

THE WEED CONTROL ACT, 1950

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 6th order, third reading of Bill number 46, "The Weed Control Act, 1950," Mr. Kennedy.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in

the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I beg to move third reading of Bill number 46, "The Weed Control Act, 1950."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as inthe motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 7.

RESTRICTED AREAS FOR SEED POTATOES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 7th order, third reading of Bill number 47, "An Act to provide for the establishment of Restricted Areas for Seed Potatoes," Mr. Kennedy.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy I move third reading of Bill number 47, "An Act to provide for the establishment of Restritted Areas for Seed Potatoes."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 38.

THE HIGH SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 38th order, second reading of Bill number 79, "An Act to amend the High Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Educaion): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, second reading of Bill number 79, "An Act to amend the High Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 39.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 39th Order, second reading of Bill number 80, "An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill number 80, "An Act to amend

the Separate Schools Act."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 40.

THE TEACHING PROFESSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 40th order, second reading of Bill number 81, "An Act to amend the Teaching Profession Act, 1944," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill number 81, "An Act to amend the Teaching Profession Act, 1944."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) if the Teachers Federation is aware of this Bill, and have given approval of it.

MR. PORTER: Oh yes, Mr Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading ofthe Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 42.

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 42nd order, second reading of Bill number 83, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act," Mr. Challies.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the hon. membersof the House are ready toproceed with this Bill or not. It has only been printed a couple of days. However, I will move second reading of Bill number 82, "An Act to amend the Power Commission Act."

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) ready to proceed with it?

MR. CHALLIES: It is a question of the principle of the Bill on second reading. I will be glad to explain it if there

are any things the hon. members want. It will be d alt with clause by clause in committeeof the whole. It only concerns a matter of three or four items.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minster): Mr. Speaker, I think for a few minutes we might go into Committee of the Whole, and take up some of these matters which are routine, in order that we may remove them fromthe order paper. After that, we will revert to the second order, and continue the debate on the Address on the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I mowe that you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the chair.

(Take B follows)

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 27.

THE PUBLIC OFFICERS FEES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-seventh Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 64, "An Act to amend the Public Officers Fees Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 64 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 28.

THE DESERTED WIVES AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-eighth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 65, "An Act to amend the Deserted Wives and Children's Maintenance Act", Mr. Porter.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, may I ask that this Bill be held over.

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Since that Bill is being held over, I wonder if we could not consider a change in section 2, that it be "$20. with costs". The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) might consider that as a suggestion.

MR. FROST: We will consider this.

Motion withdrawn.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 29.

THE INSURANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-ninth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 66, "An Act to amend the Insurance Act", Mr. Porter.

AN hon. MEMBER: I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) has been in touch with the Children's Aid Societies, and if they feel this provision is a wise change to make in the Act,

considering the original intention of it again.

MR. FROST: Are you objecting to the limitation or the increase?

AN hon. MEMBER: The increase.

MR. FROST: I think the point is this: the other sections were made years ago, and now this change brings the Act up to the economic level prior to the war.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 66 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 30.

THE MAGISTRATES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirtieth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 67, "An Act to amend the Magistrates Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 67 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 32.

THE REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-second Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 69, "An Act to amend the Real Estate and Business Brokers Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On section 4.

AN hon. MEMBER: Could I ask the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) would it be necessary, or would it be acceptable if they used a carbon copy to get the two signatures, to use a carbon copy for the signatures?

MR. PORTER: It would not make any difference whether carbon copies or individual copies in triplicate were used. They must be signed copies and have the signatures on them.

When you are buying some property, the broker, under this provision, would have to provide you with a copy of the contract which was actually signed. If he failed to live up to the promises in a contract signed by him, you could bring an action. As it was before, the brokers were not handing out copies of the agreement with original signatures, and it is sometimes difficult for a person to prove his case in the courts without a signed document in his possession.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sections 4 and 5 agreed to.

Bill No. 69 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 33.

THE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-third Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 70, "An Act to amend the School Attendance Act", Mr. Porter.

Section 1 to five inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 70 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 34.

THE AUXILIARY CLASSES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-fourth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 71, "An Act to amend the Auxiliary Classes Act", Mr. Porter.

Section 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. DENNISON (St. David): On section 3 I would like to draw to the hon. Minister(Mr. Porter) attention the possibility that some of the classes already established in Ontario for children with speech defects are apparently not taken care of under

this legislation. These are very necessary classes and not auxiliary classes. It seems to me, before the revision of this statute, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) should bring in another Bill to include those classes which have been approved by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), and as far as I can see there is no legislation authorizing it.

HON. DANA PORTER (St. George): What sort of classes are not included?

MR. DENNISON: Classes for children that have various nervous defects, and other defects of speech, not necessarily lip-reading or hard of hearing.

MR. PORTER: Surely the hon. member will look at section 2 of this Bill. That should make it clear what the government has in mind.

Subsection 2 of section 2 reads, "subject to the regulations, a board may establish and conduct classes for children who, not being persons whose mental capacity is incapable of development beyond that of a child of normal mentality at eight years of age, are from any physical or mental cause, unable to take proper advantage of public, separate, high, or vocational courses".

That would cover all manner of physical defects, and I hardly think we have to specify any further on that. On this subject, a number of establishments have been set up. In 1947 and 1948, in Brantford, Ottawa, Kitchener, York, London, there were about 4,500 pupils.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sections 4 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 71 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report certain Bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex, North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House beg leave to report certain Bills and move for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 25.

DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-eighth Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to a motion for an address in reply to the speech of the honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Session, Mr. Frost.

(Page B-6 follows)

MR. T. PRYDE (Huron): Mr. Speaker, the debate on the Speech from the Thr ne is part of our parliamentary procedure and much h s been said and written about its utility --- with much of which I agree. However, it does not serve a very useful purpose and members may offer suggestions and criticisms, criticisms that may be either constructive or destructive. Some are very donstructive and some very destructive. I honour the practice of congratulating the mover and the seconder of the reply to the Speech from the Throne, first of all, because since the end of the last Session they were elected to their respective constituencies, and secondly, they have brought great credit to themselves and to this House by their able addresses. I hope that we hear from them on many occasions.

I would like also to comment at this time on my own behalf, and I am sure on behalf of all the hon. members of the House, on the absence of some of our hon. members on account of sickness. I am sure that I express the hopes of myself and all the hon. members that they will soon be returned to normal health.

Some of the speeches this far have been ably delivered and contained much to think about. However, a great deal of what has been said by hon. members on the opposite side of this House has, in my opinion, been aimed at the wrong target. If they had fired their ammunition and directed it at Ottawa, it would hit the target. But here it was directed at the wrong time. What was said would have made wonderful opposition speeches at Ottawa.

No one in this House will dispute the assertion of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that something surely can be done about what he described as the "food paradox", where there is an abundance of food in Canada and in the United States and

elsewhere, in Europe, there are people who are, reputedly , going hungry. Great efforts have been made to alleviate this situation, but so far without complete success. However, it is outside the burden of this Legislature and this government, and I do not think we can do much about it. The great humanitarian appeal of the member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) has much to commend it. There is not an hon. member in this House who does not regret the fact that many men are jobless, and find it necessary to sleep on the floor of the Fred Victor Mission. I heartily agree with the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod).

We on this side of the House take second place to no one in our desire to alleviate human suffering and want. Possibly all of us would like to help these people, but we do not go down there at night; we feel that it is someone else's business, and I do not think that it is the direct responsibility of thig government.

I can agree also with the member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) in much that he said about the necessity for some plan to re-allocate the responsibilities of the various levels of government in this country.

We do regret the fact that many men are jobless, and hundreds are obliged to sleep on floors, but that is something that is outside the jurisdiction of this government. If you go into many offices or buildings, you will find and see a picture of a dog in great agony because of a fight with a porcupine, and people will say that the dog got into that condition because it did not mind its own business. Let us mind our own business. We have many things to take up our attention, and although not unaware of the suffering, I believe it is not the responsibility of this government to find a direct remedy by

giving them relief. The member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) said a great deal about the grants that have been given by this government to municipalities to aid in education and other municipal matters. He stressed that although these grants were given, hardships still persist. I agree with the member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) about the necessity for some plan to re-allocate the responsibilities of the various levels of government in this country. No one can deny municipal budgets are steadily increasing, not because of grants, but in spite of grants. Without grants, municipal affairs would have been in a chaotic condition, and this because of the rising costs of everything and increased demands. I agree that the time has arrived when an effort will have to be made to arrive at a point to determine the responsibilities of all various levels of government.

There is a manifest need for complete revision of powers and duties. Municipal finances are not now able to carry the burden. At this time I think it is a little premature. I am sure that our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) at the Dominion-Provincial Conference will do all in his power and will use his influence to have this thrashed out, and the burden re-distributed so that we will be able to carry on better than at the present time.

I would like to speak for a few minutes regarding the policies of the government, and of how they have been of such great benefit to my own particular riding. First of all, mine is an agricultural riding, and agriculture takes first place. That is a primary concern to all of us, but it is more so to rural members. Farmers feel that falling prices will affect them first, and are naturally most alarmed at present tendencies in that direction.

I do not want to bore you with figures. A few days ago I was speaking to a member for a city riding and he said he liked rural members to speak because the city members were concerned mostly with city affairs, and should like to hear about the country. As the hon. members know, the recent cancellation of food contracts with Britain may have far-reaching effects, and although I do not excuse the Federal government, we must admit that conditions beyond their control are mainly responsible. That situation affects the farmers.

The cancellation of the British contract will have great effect. We cannot do a great deal about it, but I appeal to you, as individuals, to go home and also to speak to your friends to eat at least one more egg per day.

I want to get in a boost for Huron. To continue with eggs, and how they affect Huron country -- we are a great egg producing country. The poultry population in 1948 was 1,218,400 -- that is a lot of hens. 218,325 cases of eggs, 30 dozen eggs to the case, were delivered to the various egg-grading stations in the county in the same year. That means 78½ million eggs. In every county we have an agricultural representative and he is an important man and a key figure. His office is a focal point for all farmers.

The Department of Agriculture has been of great assistance to my riding. I know many more of my colleagues will speak on agricultural matters, but I would like to deal with a few. I should like to sketch some of the activities in the county. We have a Beef Producers Association in the county, and a Swine Producers Association, and a Crop Improvement Association. These have all done a great work in the county, and all the men are doing everything in their power to improve

their farms. Their one object is to attain better methods to produce better food, and they are hard at it.

Huron County produces all the important crops in Ontario, with the exception of tobacco. Their object is to find better methods to produce better foods. Some of the greatest work in the agricultural field has been done by the junior farmers. The junior farmers are doing a great work, and they are a very well organized group of young men and women. They are well organized and they have eleven subsections or clubs. There are six for calves, one for swine, two for grain, one for turnips, and one for tractor maintenance. They are highly developed, and are being developed on an ever-increasing scale. They have their social activities, and they are doing a great work to make life on the farm in the rural districts, more attractive than in the past. They are doing a tremendous work on something that will be of great help in the future, because they are trying to make life attractive for people on the farm, and by keeping Ontario boys on the farm, and continuing the old system of keeping the farm in the family. That will be a great benefit to this province.

I would like to say that a group of them will be here a week from Monday, and you will have an opportunity to see them, and you will be able to judge by their appearance and their manners when you look at them, of their character. You will find that they are a great bunch of people.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PRYDE: A year ago we passed the Community Centres Act, which was to do primarily with assistance to rural districts in building community centres. Most places in Huron have taken advantage of that Act during the past year,

and they will serve a real purpose in their respective communities. I do not like to take advantage of anyone not here, but my friend, the hon. member for Wellington, North (Mr. McEwing) commented on this legislation. The Community Centres Act has been on the list since 1934, or before, and I remember during the period when this government was not in power, and we wanted a community hall in our town we tried to get a grant, and they said no fund had been provided. I believe that during the whole term of office of that party no grant was made. It was $2000 then, and now it is $5000 by this government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PRYDE: I think we should take time at this point to say how proud we are of our county, and it would not be amiss to refer to our radio station CKNX -- Wingham. It is a real institution in the county. I bring it up because it affords free time to the agricultural representatives to bring matters of interest to the farmers and gives notes on the various activities going on. It is a real need in the county, and I am glad to mention something of its work.

Before leaving the discussion of the farm, I am going to mention something that is important to all of us, particularly in the rural districts of Ontario, and that is daylight saving time. I am all in favour of daylight saving time and the municipalities should have the right to determine whether to adopt it or not. But I say something should be done as to the time when it will be brought in and when it will be terminated. Last year, due to the action of the Toronto city council, it was chaotic. Last year after the normal time for returning to standard time, if you went from one municipality to another municipality, you would not know whether it was

standard time or daylight saving time. It would be daylight saving in one municipality, and standard time in another. That was all due, or in a great measure it was due, to the action of the Toronto city council. They said that there was a power shortage, and their actions might have been justified; but we have it now on the authority of the chairman of the Hydro Commission that we are not likely to have power shortages this year. I hope something can be done so that we will not have the same conditions this year, as last.

I mentioned assistance given by this government to provide improved services of all kinds to farm people and rural communities. First and foremost, and of prime importance, is the aid given to education. I do not think we should minimize the aid to little teachers. Without this aid I fully believe that many schools in the province would have been closed for lack of teachers. These grants have enabled school boards to pay better salaries. To city members may I say that our rural schools had no modern plumbing, or hydro or central heating, Nothing except a box stove. This has been rectified, and now we have these facilities, It has been rectified in a great measure because of the grants given. Many of the schools now have hydro installed, which saves the eyesight of the children, and there is modern plumbing. It could not have been provided out of the property tax on which it existed before. Again, here we have something which will be of great help to many of the schools.

In Huron county the attendance at secondary schools in the last four years has increased fifty per cent. It was absolutely necessary to find new and increased accommodation, and you and I know that would be a great burden on property owners if they were called upon to do it without special grants. In

Huron county we have four district high schools, and we have twenty-four busses operating in the southern part of the county, and they travelled 1600 miles and provided transportation for 728 pupils. That is a recommendation, surely. The grants we received in Huron this year totalled $364,800., comprised of $181,400. elementary, $11,792, separate, and $171,606. secondary, making the total which I mentioned, $364,800. That is of tremendous assistance to the school board in Huron county.

Before leaving this question of education, let me tell you something that is operated under their supervision, and that is a travelling library. We organized the first travelling library in service, and it is well organized and supervised by the county and by the grants. It has a wide distribution, and the National Film Board made a film of it. The film would be well worth seeing. It gives you a picture of the rural life in Ontario, and the library service, and it goes into the life of the Huron inhabitants, and it shows not only the work of the library, it goes into the farm and county and shows the horses and the cattle and some of the crops, and output of the county. It is a real propoganda film and could be a hint to other counties. It has served an especial purpose in our Huron county.

On the expansion of the hydro services, I will not bore you with figures, but now we can see the lights, and it is a sight to compare it to what it was two years ago. If these services had been provided by the people, the cost would have been so high, that people in the low groups would not have been able to own their own homes. I would like to say that that could not have been done without the grants.

I would like to go on record, and give my views

on some levels. Public health is of prime importance. In many small places, and in fact, the great majority of small towns and villages, there is no sewage system and septic tanks are the order of the day. People in the couhtry have as great a right to live the same as the people in the city. There is a great demand for a sewage system, and disposal system, and the cost of installing these is prohibitive. They are almost beyond the power of the county to provide them out of their sources of revenue. I believe when this whole system of work has been levelled out, the municipal counties will be relieved to a great extent, of the responsibility for providing services which are necessary in the interest of public health. And I include not only sanitation, but also drinking water. In many cases, wells are not satisfactory. It is not far away when many small towns and villages will have to bring water from the great lakes. I believe the time has come when a great deal of the responsibility will be taken off the shoulders of the municipalities.

Hospitals also come under that heading. I will not go so far as to say they should be taken over by the province, until the levelling out and allocation of the responsibilities of the government is determined. What has done to date has been a big step in giving small towns and municipalities necessary aid in installing these services such as I have mentioned, and making it possible for them to do it. I will take up a few more minutes on this. It has been discussed before, -- social service.

I would like to be able to say that the day is not far distant when the government of Canada will inaugurate a system of contributory old age pensions. There was a great deal of talk about it before the last election, but as far as we have gone into it, is to form a committee. I hope before another

election that this will all have been gone into. I hope that it will not be far away before we will be giving honest, humane, and decent administration, not only for our aged people, but also for widowed and deserted mothers, and their children.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PRYDE: On this subject there is also another class of people, and that is the retired people. I am a rural member, and know more of this, and how it is in the small towns, than those of you in the cities. I think that the hon. members know that in small towns and villages a large percentage of our population is composed of retired people, retired some years ago, and hoping that they would be able to live on the interest of their savings, and of course, the interest has greatly dropped. The cost of living has increased, and now these retired people find it very difficult to make ends meet. They are having a hard time. I would like to say a word on their behalf, and get them into our way of thinking. They are too proud to ask for public assistance. They did not like the idea of an old age pension because they thought of it as charity. I can assure you that many of them are discussing it, and they have discussed it with me, and wondered if they would make applications for old age pensions.

(Take C follows)

I think perhaps I have spoken long enough. But I do not want to sit down without making mention of the trip to the north and northwest country which was taken by many of the hon. members here last Fall. The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) is not in his place, but I believe it is the unanimous opinion of all of us that it was a very well-organized trip. We saw a great deal which was of interest, and I believe we all benefitted from the trip. May I say to those of the northern hon. members who were our hosts at that time, that their hospitality was unbounded.. I remember one day in particular when we started at Fort Frances, and we were banquetted at breakfast; at noon, at Sioux Narrows, we were banquetted again, and at Kenora in the evening we were banquetted still further, and I am sure those of us who were on the trip will long remember the hospitality of the people of the north and northwest.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PRYDE: We saw the amazing development of that country. I do not like to mention any particular project, but it has been mentioned several times in this debate, but I would like to mention the development at Steep Rock Mines, which is one of the most amazing things we saw on the whole trip. Many of you have heard people say "Why did we not do this ourselves." Mr. Speaker, I think it is a tribute to free enterprise, to the people who take the chances, and if American capital did come in and proceed with work of this nature, may I say that it has provided many hundreds and thousands of Canadian citizens with employment, and with very badly needed United States dollars.

If we do not have enough risk capital in this country to take the chance ourselves, how will this country develop if we do not welcome foreign capital.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PRYDE: The remedy is in our own hands. Let us do our best.

MR. ROBERT THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Where did the pioneers get their capital from?

AN hon. MEMBERS: "Over 'ome."

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PRYDE: I think we have some duty to perform, and I think we should acquaint the people of southern Ontario with the facts of the development inthenorth. It has been said many times "You do not know anything aboutour country." I think that works both ways, They do not know anything about our country. I was amazed to find so many people who came from the western part of the province, and even fromthe United States, who do not know anything about Southern Ontario. Quite frankly I had a job telling people where Huron County was. I think it is a rather important place, but I found there were hundreds who never evenheard of it.

I may say, for the benefit of the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Cathcart) that I had to start at Sarnia, because most of them knew where Sarnia was, and then work up along theshores of Lake Huron, and I was finally able to locate Huron County for them in that way.

In the words of the Prime Minister a few days ago---this government does not want to have its usefulness measured by the millions of dollars it spends but by what it has done to improve the lot andliving conditions ofthe people of this province.

We must meet the challenge of the times. Much depends on the actions of government at all levels. We, of course, have no direct influence in the international field but in our own sphere, sound legislation, enacted to provide opportunity and justice to all will do much to maintain peace and harmony.

This government has a sound program which will keep the

wheels of industry in motion to create employment for our people and with a resulting demand for the food produced onour farms.

That is the cycle we wish to create and within it we will have prosperity and contentment brought about by self reliance and independence. Ontario will then have gone far to help build a strong Canadian nation.

A few days ago we heard quoted that good old Presbyterian hymn---Lead Kindly Light---which seems to sum up the difference in attitude of each side of this House---Optimism on one side---gloom onthe other.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will excuse the pointing finger, but (indicating the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), let us say:

"Lead, Kindly light, amid the encircling gloom,
Lead Thou us on;"

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Page C-4 follows)

MR. G. I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with others who have preceded me in this debate in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech. I do not wish to speak about welfare or hydro or education. I feel that others who are more able to speak on those subjects, will do so at some future time. Perhaps if we all spoke on all subjects, it might cause confusion and some overlapping. So I have decided to speak about something which is very important to Sault Ste. Marie, and I think will become important to the province. I refer to the Trans-Canada Highway.

Yesterday afternoon I had placed on the desks of every hon. member this brochure produced by the Chamber of Commerce of Sault Ste. Marie, and in it are pictures and material referring to this highway, and the uncompleted portions of it in the area surrounding Sault Ste. Marie.

Last year I spoke at some length about the Trans-Canada Highway, particularly that part known as Highway 17, and more particularly that part which is as yet incomplete. I refer, of course, to the highway north of Sault Ste. Marie, and the gap between Montreal River and Schreiber approximately 170 miles.

I gave several reasons why we, the people living in that area between Port Arthur and Sault Ste. Marie, think the government should complete this unfinished portion, or reveal if they plan to finish it, or give a report on the deliberations at the several conferences between the provincial and Federal governments, on this subject.

I recall that nothing was said on this matter in the Throne Speech last year. However, I do recall that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) during a discussion of his estimates, stated that the Federal government and this government

had come to no defi ite conclusions regarding the Trans-Canada Highway. Since then the governments have been in conference again and I understand the officials of the department have been continuing negotiations.

Therefore, I again place before this government and the hon. members of this Legislative Assembly our several reasons why we in the district of Sault Ste. Marie think this unfinished portion of Highway 17, north of Montreal River to Schreiber, approximately 170 miles, should be completed. I will also present a case for the completion of many unfinished roads, in my riding, which, if completed, would connect the Highway 11, the northern route of the Trans-Canada Highway and Highway 17 the southern route.

In 1943 an association, the product of many similar but smaller groups, was formed and called themselves the Lake Superior High way Association. Their purpose w s to promote and educate the public to the benefits of a highway around the shore of Lake Superior and to place before responsible authorities the need for such a highway.

The first convention was held in the spring of 1943 at Port Arthur, at which time over two hundred delegates attended. There were delegates from Michigan, Minnesota, Illinois and Wisconsin. Many of them were elected members of state and municipal governments. Many of them were members of Chambers of Commerce and Automobile Associations. Also counted amongst those attending were representatives of Canadian cities, towns and organizations. They again met in conference in Sault Ste. Marie, January 17, 1949 and again resolved to send a brief to Cabinet members of the Federal government and to the members of the Cabinet of the Ontario government. This I understand was

done, and I understand that just recently each member of this Legislature has been forwarded a copy. My reason for presenting these facts and the activities of the Lake Superior Association is to prove that the agitation is not just a local group of selfish individuals seeking personal gain but a truly representative group of citizens, most of them elected by such groups as Chambers of Commerce, Automobile Associations, city and town councils, and labor unions.

Added to the resolutions of the Lake Superior Association must be those sent from the various interested groups in the area vitally affected and interested, such as the city councils of Port Arthur, Fort William, Sault Ste. Marie and many towns and organizations too numerous to mention.

Now in all these resolutions, none have contended that the Lake Shore Route should be the only route, but they do claim that it is the shortest and most logical route.

We are not ignoring the fact that it might appear that we are seeking to serve our own selfish desires. We acknowledge that it will bring benefits to local business and will provide employment, etc. But our motive is not ulterior, for we believe, for reasons I will later give, that it will benefit the whole province, in fact, the whole nation.

We recognize that a means of crossing Ontario already exists on Highway 11. This is accomplished by turning north off Highway 17 at North Bay, then proceeding on to Cochrane, then west to Kapuskasing, Hearst, again joining Highway 17 at Nipigon. This is the northern route paralleling the Canadian National Railway and was completed as a joint defence measure during the war. However, not ignoring the need or usefulness of this highway to transport military equipment and personnel

during a war, should a breakdown in railroad transportation occur, also not ignoring the fact that it is a social and economic need to serve the communities situated along this route, we maintain that it would be more costly to maintain because of many swampy areas, because of a local lack of ballast and fill, and because it runs through a very heavy snow belt which would involve snow clearing difficulties. Nevertheless, this route, Highway 11 from North Bay to Nipigon, is an essential highway and will continue to serve that area and to meet any emergency during a war.

However, we advocate the completion of Highway 17, particularly that unfinished stretch between Montreal River and Schreiber. I believe the highway is completed between Nipigon and Schreiber and from Schreiber on, there has been much work, preliminary work such as surveying and dirt roads to Terrace and Marathon.

As long ago as November 24, 1934, the Ontario government, by Order-in-Council, designated the route of the Trans-Canada Highway as following the North Bay, Sudbury, Sault Ste. Marie trunk road thence northerly to Batchewana, Carp River, Michipicotten and White River to Schreiber.. Strictly speaking, the selection has never been seriously challenged. Its completion was delayed during the war and work has not been resumed because of a lack of men and materials. That obstacle no longer exists, for there are many unemployed and there is plenty of material. There is one other factor which might have delayed resumption and that is the alleged and exaggerated impression that the cost over rough terrain particularly between Agawa and Heron Bay, would be excessive. However, more recent knowledge of the terrain and the advance in technique and road-building machinery have

combined to banish this bugaboo of excessive costs. There are no serious bridging problems and no swampy areas. There is available every mile of the route an abundance of gravel and rock fill. There is one alleged, formidable obstacle known as the Agawa promontory. However, survey by engineers leads us to believe that this could be very easily overcome by cutting a shelf at an approximate cost of $500,000. This result would rival the magnificent scenic attraction of the upper and lower Coniche Drive of the Mediterranean coast. There is assurance that except for the two and one-half miles in the Agawa Promontory, the remainder of the 170 miles would only involve simple roadbuilding procedure.

As I have before stated, there are very good reasons why we advocate the building of this highway, in fact, there are four very good reasons and I will give them in their order of priority.

First: - and this is important and an immediate need, in fact, it is a long-standing need that has not been met. There are some tens of thousands of Ontario citizens living in that area between Sault Ste. Marie and Schreiber. To mention a few, Batchewana, Montreal River, Agawa, Michipicotten, Wawa, Helen Mine, Hawk, Franz, Missanabie, Localch, Godreau, White River, Hornepayne and on the other end, Shrieber, Jackfish, Terrace Bay, Marathon and Heron Bay. These are all very important mining, railroad, lumbering, fishing, tourist and pulp and paper communities. Some have been established for generations, some for more than a half century. Most of them have not grown any bigger, some have become smaller, and some have developed. The people living in these communities are doing the backbreaking job of extracting the wealth

from the earth, some servicing our railroads, others are working in pulp mills and sawmills. They are all doing essential work. They live a lonely, isolated existence and they are discontented. They have only one way in and out, by railroad. Therefore, I am primarily concerned that the government build highways and roads to service the people living in this north western hinterland. Build them roads so that they can fraternize with each other, roads by which they can use the hospital, medical and dental services in adjacent areas. Build them roads so that they can purchase a car so that they can drive out of this wilderness once in awhile. I am going to give you an illustration that existed for many years until remedied last year.

Wawa on the Algoma Central Railway, has a population of 2,000. It is growing like a mushroom; it is at present unincorporated. Situated at Wawa is the Helen Mine discovered back in the last century. It is the source of much of the iron ore used in the Algoma Steel Plant at Sault Ste. Marie. This is a low-grade ore and is sintered at the plant in Wawa. They expect to mine and treat 1,000,000 tons of ore this year. Other iron ore prospects in this area are being explored and we anticipate much expansion. People working in these mines and mills are performing very essential work and hazardous work and are very often seriously injured. And people there, their wives and children, like all wives and children, become sick and need medical and hospital care. However, there is no hospital at Wawa and there was no doctor for many years, and it was hard to keep a qualified nurse. Just twenty miles away at Hawk there is a very fine Red Cross Hospital, fully equipped and there is, and always was, a doctor. The only way the sick and injured from Wawa could be taken to

this hospital was by train, running every other day or by freight, or railway motor car after obtaining special permission of the chief dispatcher.

Now, between Wawa and Hawk (population 800) is an old unused logging road and could very easily be conditioned so that an ambulance could be driven over it, or a car. But for many years this situation was ignored and not until last year was anything done. Similar situations exist in many areas of this area and in general, all over the riding of Sault Ste. Marie and district.

During the depression many miles of highway and roads were built in that territory north of Sault Ste. Marie, roads between Michipicotten and White River, between White River and Hornepayne, and between Hornepayne and Hearst. So all I am asking, now, is that the government finish a job that was started as a relief measure. This work was done at considerable cost, even though it was done by slave labour. It was done by a generation which became heroes in the 40's, but were exiled to this area in the 30's to build highways for $5.00 a month, and board. These roads are still there, and if completed would form part of a comprehensive highway system linking the southern route, Highway 17, with the northern route of Highway 11 of the Trans-Canada Highway. The people living in small towns and villages such as Terrace Bay, Marathon, Heron Bay, Hornepayne, White River, Michipicotten, Wawa, Hawk and many others, could then drive out to two highways. It would integrate the whole system and would provide alternate routes. Tourists entering Ontario from the west could come as far as Heron Bay on Highway 17, then if they did not want to travel around the lake shore of Lake Superior they could turn off to the north through

White River, Hornepayne and Hearst, and join the northern route, Highway 11, and carry on through Kapuskasing, Cochrane, and North Bay, and thence to Ottawa or Toronto on Highway 17 and 11 respectively. Tourists entering Ontario at Sault Ste. Marie could drive around the lake shore through Montreal Harbour, Michipicotten, on to Heron Bay, and then turn north to Hearst and Highway 11, and then either turn east or west to Schreiber, Port Arthur and Fort William.

The completion of Highway 17 along the shore of Lake Superior, and the completion of the few short stretches of unfinished highways, I have mentioned, would open up a tourist and commercial potential not existing anywhere. This, with perhaps excepting the North West Territory, is the last remaining area left to be developed. Minerals in abundance, iron ore, gold, silver, uranium and many others, pulp and paper, lumbering, commercial fishing and tourists projects. But more important, I think, is the highway service it will provide for the people now living in that area. It will give them an opportunity to drive out occasionally to the city for a vacation and it will give them a chance to drive out to hospital, medical and dental services unavailable in this vast isolated area. That is why I have given priority to building roads to serve our own people.

The second reason for completing that part of Highway 17 is the tourist potential of the area. Living within twenty-four hours' drive of Sault Ste. Marie are 30,000,000 Americans. I do not suggest that they all are eager to drive around Lake Superior, but most of them, through Chambers of Commerce and Automobile Associations, have expressed the desire to do so. It is surprising the number who come as far as Sault Ste. Marie,

Michigan, and then turn around when they discover they cannot drive around Lake Superior. One does not have to stretch his imagination too much to envision what would happen if this highway were completed. In all probability, it would provide us with about two or three hundred million extra American dollars. However, it is not so much the actual amount of American dollars that would be gained, but the compounded increase in provincial income due the development, and increased purchasing power.

Why is this area declared such a paradise for tourists? First, it is virgin territory, unpolluted, undefiled. There are veritably thousands of crystal-clear lakes in which no line has yet been cast. We believe these lakes are teeming with fish, and they are set in beautiful wooded areas. There is abundant game.

And for those who wish to hunt with a movie camera, those who appreciate the beauties of nature, this is one of the last remaining hardwood areas in Ontario. In the fall one is treated to a panorama of colour unsurpassed anywhere. The brilliant scarlet and gold of the maples, the more sombre browns and yellow of the oak, the shimmering silver and brighter yellows of the birch and beech, interspersed with glistening poplars, and the filigree splendour of the tamarack, all beautifully blended with the various shades of the green of the spruce, fir, hemlock, and pine. In and out of season, one can take pictures of waterfalls cascading down over varicoloured rocks. It is truly a paradise for the artist and nature lover. This is a balm for the weary industrial worker and the nerve-wracked office worker. A vacation in this area, either with fishing line, rifle, camera, or paint brush, is out of this world.

The third reason why we consider it essential that this 1 st remaining gap in Highway 17 be completed is to develop the industrial and commercial potential. Immediate resumption of work on this highway will help to avert the decline of our provincial economy. We know that it will not absorb all the unemployed in Ontario, nor for that matter will it absorb the unemployed in Sault Ste. Marie, but it will release idle funds in the hands of insurance and loaning associations, which, in turn, would provide purchasing power in wages and salaries, not only for the men actually working on the road construction jobs but in all those enterprises, commercial and industrial, providing services and commodities because of an accentuated economic expansion. We believe that development in iron ore, in gold and uranium to be found, and already found in this area, will provide work and purchasing power for our unemployed. We envision a multitude of services necessary in such an expansion, opportunities for gas stations, service repair stations, hotels, tourist resorts and retail establishments of all descriptions, sawmills, lumbering, commercial fishing, pulp wood and a little agriculture. We are optimistic about the results of opening up this territory, we believe that the resultant development will add two hundred million dollars to the provincial annual income.

There is another reason why we consider that the undeveloped portion of Highway 17 should be completed. This is increasing in importance and I referred to it last year. I refer to the strategic position of Sault Ste. Marie in the defence scheme of this North American Continent. This area around Sault Ste. Marie is highly vulnerable. Not only do we, living in that area, consider it vulnerable, but both

governments, our own Federal government and the Federal government of the U.S.A. consider it so. Ottawa has just recently issued a statement th t such places as Chalk River, Port Hope and Sault Ste. Marie are top priority for defence measures. The U.S.A. government has more recently arranged to have a regiment of troops stationed in Sault Ste; Marie, Michigan, and there is the possibility of immediate joint action to have American troops stationed on both sides of the canal.

As an indication of the importance of this matter, let me point out that the government at Ottawa has recently started to build a half-million dollar armoury at Sault Ste. Marie, and is already maintaining an anti-aircraft regiment there. Therefore, you will appreciate that both responsible governments have recognized the vulnerability and the strategic position of the canal at Sault Ste. Marie.

During the second world war, stationed in and around Sault Ste. Marie were some 14,000 Canadian and American troops, anti-aircraft regiments and auxiliary troops. There were about sixty barr ge balloons suspended above the canal. There were listening posts all the way up to St. James Bay and there were fighter interceptor squadrons stationed there.

Now all these defence measures were thought necessary during the second world war, not against German aggression but against Russian aggression, for if you recall, it was not until the non-aggression pact was signed in 1941 between Russia and Germany that this defence of the canal was established. Russia is again the potential attacker and high on its list for immediate destruction would be the canal system at Sault Ste. Marie. Why? Because eighty per cent of the iron ore used in the steel industry of this North American Continent

passes through that canal. There is no important material than steel in any war. It is also well to remember that the arsenal, or rather one of the important arsenals in the last war was Detroit, and it will be again. Therefore the hub of a defence strategy will be concentrated around this area and the most vital and vulnerable will be Sault Ste. Marie.

It is indeed possible that the battle ground, such as there will be, will be to the north. And it is possible that the first bomb will be dropped not on New York, but on Sault Ste. Marie, and in all probability it will fall without warning, another Pearl Harbour or Hiroshima. There will be no front line in the next war, remote places, particularly strategical places like Sault Ste Marie will be immediate targets, and it is quite within reason that whole populations might have to be evacuated overnight.

Now we in Sault Ste. Marie think, as I believe the governments of Canada and the United States think, that the defence and all the details of such a defence for this highly vulnerable area should be built up. I have already mentioned what measures have been taken, but I believe the Department of National Defence should implement training in Black Out precautions, fire drill, first aid and de-contamination drill for that whole area in the event that it be bombed with atom or hydrogen bombs. I know it sounds fantastic to suggest such precautions but it is well to remember that the First World War was fought and won from the outside in, the second World War was fought and won partially from the inside out. The next will be fought from the inside out with guided missiles, long range bombing of strategical areas. The authorities have not yet devised any defence measures against such attacks,

however we must not remain idle, we must be prepared.

We think the first important preparation is the completion of Highway 17 for we recognize the inadequacy of the present situation regarding the transportation of military supplies and personnel. And should it be necessary to evacuate the population of Sault Ste. Marie we want to get out in a hurry and the most logical way would be on Highway 17 to the North.

In summing up I will repeat the four reasons why we consider the completion of Highway 17 highly essential.

First to provide highway and road facilities for thos people living in that area doing the hard back-breaking jobs extracting the wealth in minerals, pulp and paper, lumber, and servicing our railroads.

Second to develop the tourist potential in that area.

Third to develop the commercial and industrial potential of the area, which is the last remaining section in Ontario left to be developed and exploited.

Fourth to satisfy, not only a local need, but a national and international need in the completion of an adequate defence scheme.

I trust that the highway will be completed to satisfy the first three reasons given. I hope it never becomes a military highway. I sincerely hope it will not become a highway to war, destruction and desolation but a Highway to peace, happiness and prosperity, and it could then be designated the highway to the future.

(Take D follows)

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, may I follow the time-honoured custom of congratulating the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. They have performed their duty in an admirable way and deserve the congratulations of all this honourable House. Although I realze that they said things that perhaps they did not believe in themselves and many of their remarks were placed in their speech by the various Ministers --

Hon. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): No, times have changed. We do not do that now.

MR. HOUCK: That will be the day -- I felt that they brought honour to the Government they represent.

However, during the time at my disposal, I will refer specifically to a few of the remarks made by the hon. member from Leeds (Mr. Reynolds). However, before doing that, Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate you for doing what not only I consider, but all of us I am sure, a very fine job as Speaker of this honourable House. You are performing your duties in an impartial way, and we do appreciate it.

I also want to congraulate the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) on his election as Leader of the Conservative Party of the Province of Ontario. Naturally, with the rest of the hon. members on this side of the House, we were not invited to attend this great convention when the selection of a leader was made. However, many of us listened in over the radio with a great deal of interest. I rather felt that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) would be making an extra inning game of the

convention, but evidently things were pretty well taken care of before time.

My sympathy, of course, went to the hon. Minister of Education and now the Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) as well. I felt it was rather ironical that many of us listened to the sixty-four dollar question on the radio and then the hon. Minister, at the conclusion of the voting, was given sixty-four votes himself.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Sixty-five.

MR. HOUCK: I refer to my speech last year. The contented look on all the hon. Ministers' faces after their one-time leader had gone to Ottawa to seek bigger game and I can still see, Mr. Speaker, that same sort of appearance on all the faces of the hon. members of the Cabinet, and it surely must be a relief to them that they at least have the authority to run their various Departments as they see fit, because of the fact they are fortunate to have a leader who does not want to hog all the glory for himself.

I want to say too, Mr. Premier, that I am very happy to see some of your members are taking part in your radio broadcasts. I listened with a lot of interest to the hon. member from Nipissing (Mr. Harvey) a week or so ago, and I am sure your Government and your members as well will co-operate a lot better because of the fact you are not wielding the big stick and you are willing to share the affairs of the Government with your cohorts. That, indeed, is a true symbol of democracy when a Government has various ideas and can present them to the people of the Province through various mouths and not through one

lone voice as was done previously a few years ago. That lone voice now seems to be crying in the wilderness.

Naturally I express my regret at the absence of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley), of whom I have a lot of personal respect and for the former hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Blackwell) as well. I can only express the wish that they are well on the road to recovery.

I presume it is my part as a member of the Opposition to be more or less critical in this debate, but, may I assure the hon. members of this House that I shall take the stand that my criticism will at least try to be constructive criticism. As in this day and age so many various forces through their destructive criticism are continually tearing down what we call democracy. It is my firm belief we would have a stronger democracy and a better world in which to live if along with our criticism we gave some constructive ideas.

May I say to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) that I appreciate the fact in his submission to the House, that some of the money he is setting aside for highways will be used for some sort of construction at Burlington to eliminate the terrific bottle-neck which has occurred there for years. I think that is one of the most necessary jobs to be performed here in the Province of Ontario. May I just give you an example of an instance on Blossom Sunday last May. That bridge at Burlington stopped traffic until the time it was dropped again. Traffic was completely blocked as far back as Grimsby; this, in a two-abreast fashion, and sometimes it has taken me longer to get through that strip at Burlington, especially on a

week-end night, than it would take me to come from Niagara Falls to Burlington itself. I am sure all the hon. members in this part of the Province appreciate this venture, Mr. Minister, and will co-operate with you in any way possible.

I also spoke about the completion of the Queen Elizabeth Highway from Niagara Falls to Fort Erie. I was given to understand that because of the price of cement, it would take at least an average of 4,000 cars a day over that 20 mile strip to make it worthwhile placing a cement road along that mileage. Naturally, I did not want to be unfair pertaining to this, so I have felt the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) performed at least a worthwhile job when he did lay a black base from Fort Erie to Niagara Falls on one side of the highway, and may I make this observation, Mr. Minister, because of the fact I travel this road almost daily, that you have a very dangerous intersection at what is known as the crossing of the Sodom Road at the Queen Elizabeth Highway. Barely a week passed last summer that we did not have two or three unfortunate accidents and one or more serious accidents, because of that danger point. Traffic coming from the north cannot see traffic only from the north-west on the Queen Elizabeth Highway, and although the Sodom Road is a "stop" road, not only strangers but some of the people in that vicinity have been involved in these accidents.

You have the red and green lights at all the important intersections on the Queen Elizabeth Highway, and I think you would be well advised to place one at this intersection as soon as possible.

Much was said in the Session last year concerning Hydro, and I can only repeat what I said at that time, that I felt once Hydro really got started after making two or three false starts, they have been doing a good job. I do not want to rehash old hash, Mr.Speaker, pertaining to the Des Joachims development, because I understand now that once Hydro started the development itself, they are now at least five months ahead of schedule, which only goes to show there is some initiative behind this gigantic project.

We felt, on this side of the House, and I think rightly so, that we are entitled to know, as we asked last year and received no answer, whether the Province of Quebec was entitled to half of the power from the Des Joachims development. My memory serves me quite clearly in this respect that when this Bill was first put through the House under the Liberal Government, Mr. Drew was very bitter in his arguments against it, stating that the Bill was one of the most important to come before the House, and then accused the then government of the day of trying to speed it through as quickly as possible.

At that time we were engaged in a serious war, and it was our duty to provide power for the war industries of the Province. No industry in Ontario had been refused power by the Commission, and I know that I felt,as well as other members of the Commission, that adequate supplies of power were as important to the war effort as the man in uniform. Mr. Drew firmly stated that if a succeeding government took office, they would not be bound to this agreement.

On March 23rd, 1948, in this House, Mr. Drew stated, and I quote:

> "--the present development is a joint development which has some very interesting features which have been brought about as a result of that very high degree of co-operation existing between the Government of Ontario and the Government of Quebec. Under the arrangements which exist, the actual construction is being carried out by the Hydro Electric Power Commission, and it will be possible for the Quebec authorities to draw their share of the power, if in the future, they decide they wish that power".

This, to me, Mr. Speaker, is plain that the Premier of the time was operating under this agreement and this Government under its hon. leader owes it to the hon. members of this House, either through his Hydro Minister or himself, to give us the details of this agreement for which we have been waiting for the last two years.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I can say to my hon. friend (Mr. Houck) there is no mystery about that at all. We are operating under the agreement of 1943. It is true I would like us to have a joint agreement on the Ottawa River, but the great difficulty is that some years ago agreements were entered into when the hon. members opposite were in a group which had a great many more members than they have at present, when they covered this side of the House and spread around to the other side. They negotiated a deal renewing or re-instating

the contracts which were repudiated, into which they put an acceleration clause. The great difficulty is that nobody can generate power for $12.50 per horsepower, or $15.00 per horsepower. If we enter into an arrangement on the Ottawa River for joint power which runs us about $12.50, it accelerates the whole picture. I imagine the hon. member (Mr. Houck) had something to do with inserting that clause in the agreements of those days, which is a bar to our going ahead with joint development, which is very desirable on the Ottawa River.

May I say to my hon. friend (Mr. Houck) that one of the reasons the City of Ottawa - or, rather, the Power Commission - purchased the Ottawa Light, Heat and Power, rather than the Hydro Commission was because there were contracts which we would have had to take over, which might have accelerated our whole cost of power.

We have to meet the obligations. The contracts are there, and we must guide ourselves accordingly. We cannot chang the situation. We do not repudiate things. The hon. members opposite, in the best of their judgment - whether it was good or bad - made these arrangements, and we have to carry them out, and we are doing the best we can to provide Ontario with lots of power, as cheaply as we can. That is the whole answer.

MR. HOUCK: Then do I understand that Quebec is entitled to fifty percent. of the power at Des Joachims?

MR. FROST: No. The agreement of 1943 is there. We have never been able to negotiate anything further.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Did you ever find out what Mr. Drew meant when he made that suggestion?

MR. FROST: No, he was not a Lindsay lawyer.

MR. HOUCK: A few years ago we were accused of assuming a dictatorship attitude in trying to put something through with inadequate information being given to the House. So I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that we should demand before the close of this session to know more about the agreement entered into with the Province of Quebec about the Des Joachims development, whether or not they are to get some of the power and whether or not they are to get some of the power and whether or not as Mr. Drew stated, Quebec was entitled to 50 percent. of the labour.

I realize that when the Des Joachims development was first talked about with the Province of Quebec, they were interested in the Carrillon development, because of the fact that it was only 55 to 60 miles to the City of Montreal, and were interested in this project more than the Des Joachims development, because it would be 90 miles closer to Toronto than the Carrillon development. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Government of the day will be fair enough to let us in on the inside of this so we will know the details concerning its operation. The big mogul of the Hydro a few years ago departed for broader fields, where he did not receive the power he thought he would get, and I am glad to see since his departure, Hydro has been going full steam ahead -- if I might use the expression, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, may I just interject there? You should have thought at that time about eastern Ontario's share, which

we now cannot get back.

MR. HOUCK: I am getting entirely fed up with hon. members of the Government side of the House continually referring to the small mileage of rural lines erected under the last year of the Liberal administration. In all fairness to the vice-chairman of the Hydro Commission, I personally have never heard him use this argument, but, continually from the Government benches and the Private Members, and then again, from the hon. member from Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) in his moving the Speech from the Throne, we heard a reference to the small mileage.

It sounds good to them and I imagine it is very pleasant to their ears, but at that time, Mr. Speaker, as all the hon. members of this House know, we were under the priority system; war was at its full height, and our first obligation was to industry to furnish the wherewithal for the boys overseas. I want to be fair in this, Mr. Speaker, and that is the reason it disturbs me, the fact that when we complained bitterly that Hydro were two or three years late in starting Des Joachims development, all we could hear was that they could not get priorities; they could not get materials and they could not get labour, and the same thing is absolutely true pertaining to the erection of just a few miles of rural lines during our last year of administration.

Certainly if the shoe fits on one foot, it naturally must fit on the other foot as well. I believe, Mr.Speaker, the people of this Province, through power shortages and through inconvenience, lost a lot more through the fact that Des Joachims Power Development was late in starting

than did some of the farmers to whom we could not give service at that time.

Naturally our Commission felt and rightly so, the same as the present Commission, the farmers should be given electricity just as soon as possible, and as soon as available because electric power is the essential deciding force in keeping our younger generation on the farm, but, once industries were tied in war operations in supplying power, then I do not think, Mr. Speaker, this criticism is justifiable.

The hon. member from Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) also read some letters between the former Hon. Mr. Hepburn and the Hon. Mackenzie King. These letters have been read so many times that I think we know every word by heart and let me remind him that the Globe and Mail as of February 16th, 1943, carried a headline saying -- "Drew says less power will be needed soon" and it was perhaps for this reason that he made the statement before this Legislature, that no following Government would be bound to recognize the Des Joachims agreement and he voted against its ratification. However, may I say this, Mr. Speaker, and it is said in a tone of constructive criticism, that I felt Hydro would have been well advised had they bought more of their cement from the United States for the construction of the various projects and allowed the Canadian cement to be available for industry and house building. Many of the cement contractors have told me that it cost them thousands of dollars because of the fact they had to buy cement from the United States. When one considers, Mr. Speaker, that in 1948 the Hydro used 682,240 barrels of cement and had contracted for in 1949 for con-

struction and maintenance work 1,587,000 barrels of cement, one can see how the cement question for home building especially was very difficult and even, Mr. Speaker, at the borderline, which I have the honour to represent, I was continually having people come into my office, asking assistance to get just a few bags of cement. According to the figures by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics -- imports into Canada for cement were -- in 1946 -- 66,678 barrels; in 1947 when Hydro really started to get into high gear 394,356 barrels were imported. In 1948 -- 497,986 barrels and in 1949 for the first eleven months, 903,272 barrels. With 350 pounds to a barrel, you can well see the terrific amount of cememt that industry and private people had to buy because of the lack of cement in this Province.

The Customs duty on this is eight cents per 100 pounds and the weight of the package is included in the weight for duty. The cement from the States, I believe, is 94 pounds to a bag; our Canadian cement is 87½ pounds to a bag. This made big business for the United States as far as our cement dealers were concerned but we had to pay the price because of the freight and trucking from the United States.

I realize at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think the Hydro did import quite a bit of cement from the Old Country and I realize as well the fact that the developments were important because no one knows what the future holds and one must be prepared.

However, as I said previously, expansion of industry and the building of homes suffered materially through the Hydro not importing more cement and leaving more Canadian cement available for our own people. May I say this to the

Vice-Chairman of Hydro (Mr. Challies) that I hope that the next time they decide to raise Hydro rates in hydro municipalities, we will be given more notice than we had last December. Last December, Mr. Speaker, we were notified that retroactive to the first of November we would have to raise our Hydro rates to the consumer. This alone in Niagara Falls meant that at least until we could get out our new Hydro bills that we would lost over $4,000. a month. What we originally thought would be approximately a ten per cent increase turned out to be somewhere in the neighbourhood of 20 to 25 per cent increase in many Hydro municipalities. I believe, Mr. Speaker, at the last convention just a few days ago, that a resolution was presented to the convention that -- whereas an increase in the cost of power was announced to the municipalities in late December, 1949, and whereas the necessity for such increase has been apparent to the officials of the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario for some months prior to the announcement and whereas the belated announcement has caused the municipalities a considerable loss of revenue as compared with unknown cost, therefore be it resolved that this Association strongly urges upon the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario that in future any changes in costs requiring changes in the interim rates be announced to the municipalities at least two months prior to the effective date of the increase in interim rates and further that the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario be requested to keep the municipalities fully advised from time to time of the trend of the cost of power to the municipalities.

I think Chairman Saunders is putting up a lot of fight in order to provide power to an ever-growing province

but some day a reckoning will have to be made of the terrific amount of money which is being spent at the present time. Mr. Saunders said in a speech at Niagara Falls a few weeks ago that Hydro has reason to be proud of its predecessors, Truer words were never spoken because they have been doing a magnificent job in keeping pace with the industrial expansion of Ontario.

(page D-14 follows)

I realize the costs of the Ess Joachims development because of the lateness of getting it started is going to cost a lot more money than was previously thought. In 1939 we were paying the prevailing rate to drillers of 49 cents an hour; now $1.16 is being paid. Rural linesmen in 1939 were being paid 69 cents and are now receiving $1.50. Carpenters were paid 59 cents an hour and to-day $1.40 an hour and they rightly deserve that wage, which is making construction costs very high. When we consider the fact that Hydro are the trustees for 1.017 municipalities, we can well realize the tremendous job they must do.

I was glad to hear the hon Premier (Mr. Frost) make the explanation the other day that Hydro purchased in Canada, material and equipment to the value of $86,750,000. and I believe, if my figure is right, that over $81,000,000. or 81.25 was spent in Ontario; $3,750,000. was spent in the United Kingdom and $4,695,000. was spent in the United States. Construction costs for hydro development are enormous when we consider that in 1949 over three million dollars was spent by Hydro for tower steel alone; over three and a quarter million dollars for cement; two and three-quarter million dollars for copper wire; three and one-quarter million dollars for power transformers; almost three million dollars for aluminum wire; one and three-quarter million for hydraulic turbines; three and a half million for hydraulic generators and over three million and a half dollars for steam turbine generating units and that over 800 trucks were purchased at a cost of almost two million dollars. I am sure I am expressing the feelings of the Members of my Party that we will follow Hydro in any constructive ideas that they have with the Province

being now over ninety percent. electrified. Hydro needs the help of each and every one of our citizens.

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not refer to the work of the Department of Travel and Publicity, especially in Niagara Falls and Fort Erie. As you know, and I do not mean to unduly brag about it, we have in Niagara Falls what is considered one of the show places of the world, and, when we realize the number of visitors and cars which enter at Niagara Falls alone, we can see just how gigantic our tourist trade is going to be. May I give the following figures to this Honourable House.

Motor cars, 1949, entering on Travellers Vehicle permits (48 hours or more).....262,442

Motor cars, 1949, entering for less than 48 hours as Non-Permit visitors.....501,514

It is estimated that each car carries 3.3 persons. This would place the volume of visitors as:

Permit car entries.....	866,058
Non-permit car entries.....	1,664,996
Total car entries.....	2,531,054

(page D-16 follows)

Canada's revenue from tourism in 1948 was approximately 282 million dollars and of that amount 272 million dollars was brought in by visitors from the United States. To ensure a continuance of this large business volume, I can only advocate a planned program of publicity activities.

I think the Department here is doing a good job along that line because worthwhile publicity always comes forth when the visitors have reported on their trip in their various newspapers, magazines, or on their radio programs.

I think sometimes, Mr.Speaker, our merchants fail to realize the importance of the American tourist dollar to their business, and they themselves should do more advertising. In the boom year of 1929, some 184 million dollars was brought into our Dominion through the tourist traffic. The low year was in the year 1942,when the tourist expenditures dropped to 79 million. Until the peak was reached in 1946, the total number of border crossings into Canada by residents of United States amounted to more than 25 million in 1948, and it would be larger than this if we could count in the short-term visitors who remain in Canada for a matter of hours rather than days or weeks. It is the tourists who stay 48 hours or more that naturally spend the most money, and in 1948, it is estimated that they spent a total of something like 120 million dollars. It is considered that an average of 8.62 is spent daily by Canadians in the United States, as against the daily average expenditure of 1.93 by Americans in Canada. This is on a per capita basis, which makes the Canadian figures appear to be much greater. In figuring it on a per capita basis, there is not much difference

between the average spent by Canadian in United States or a person fro the United States in Canada. Last summer at Niagara Falls we really had more people than at any other time, but they were not spending the money they had been previously.

(page D-18 follows)

Upon returning, the tourist tells what a wonderful place he has seen and then other people want to come back and see our shores as well. And I pay my respects to the people in Niagara Falls, and not only Niagara Falls but all border points who form a welcoming committee, Mr. Speaker, to the people who visit the shores of Ontario. I might say we are the veranda of Ontario. If we give these people a hearty welcome and their first sight of our province becomes also their last sight upon leaving and we give them a hearty good-bye when they leave they will have, if I may use the expression, a good taste in their mouth and it is a good advertisement for the province in which we are privileged to live.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two now to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). However, I see he has left the House, but perhaps I can leave these few thoughts with hon. members and I will be brief because I understand the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) wants to adjourn at four-thirty.

During the past few years, there has been a pronounced increase in the cost of wages and labour and in materials. This increase is just as much applicable to a municipality as it is to a private individual or industry, and it means that every form or type of work that the municipality engages in, the costs are greatly in excess of what they were in the past. There is only one way by which these costs can be financed and that is through the ratepayer and the burden on real estate is reaching the saturation point and in fact, will result in the loss in equity to a great number of people unless something can be done to alleviate this condition.

The maintenance and construction of roads and streets in the municipality is just as much of prime importance, in

fact possibly even more so than it is throughout the Province. Some assistance is presently provided by the Department of Highways but it is pitifully inadequate and I believe that the Government should give serious consideration to enlarging the grants or subsidies payable to municipality for this purpose. The revenue derived from the gasoline tax is considerable and inasmuch as it is derived from those who use the streets and highways, it therefore seems logical that when repair or construction is needed, it should be used for that purpose. If more assistance were given by the Province, it would be of great benefit to the individual municipalities.

The problem of providing adequate hospitalization services to the residents of a municipality is also one of very vital importance and one which is becoming increasingly difficult to bear. The same facotrs that apply to the costs of any other type of work apply here and in order to avoid adding further expense to the ratepayers, the Province, by virtue of its wider scope of taxation, could supply some major assistance financially and it would thus be spread over so thinly that the individual burden would not be appreciably felt and yet would enable the authorities administering such institutions to provide what they would like to provide in the way of facilities and service.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to a subject which has been mentioned many times in this debate -- the problem of unemployed employables is also rapidly reaching a crux and unless some immediate and adequate action is taken will achieve serious proportions and financially cripple a great number of municipalities.

Under the present set-up, if anything in the way of assistance is granted by the municipality to such a person, one hundred percent. of the cost has to be assumed by that municipality, the result being, that frequently assistance has probably been withheld to the point where the family may be suffering severe hardship, but, if a concrete indication were given by the Provincial and Federal authorities that the financial wherewithal were to be made available, this condition would not come into being.

I do not think anyone would knowingly permit any person to suffer where even slight financial assistance could be of benefit. This problem is not one that is the fault of the individual municipality, but is brought about by a general deterioration of conditions throughout the Province, and the Dominion, and it certainly should be realized that the carrying of such an exorbitant burden should be borne by the major governments, rather than the municipalities or the lowest level of government. Administration -- yes, that is a problem of the municipality by virtue of the fact they have the more intimate knowledge, but the actual assistance should be forthcoming from another source.

I do want to say this, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Vice-Chairman of Hydro (Mr. Challies), in regard to the starting of the Niagara Development, which we do appreciate beyond any expression of words.

I think the Niagara Development should be put first, not from a selfish reason whatsoever, because I really feel the St. Lawrence is just as important in the long picture, but the Niagara Development would only take three years, where the St. Lawrence would take from five to six years

before power could be delivered. I fully realize that both of these projects are essential to the future prosperity of our Province. In conversation with the Hydro officials, I know that the Ottawa government and the federal government at Washington, as well, have been most co-operative. With the Niagara, full use of the head and above the upper rapids can be utilized through the gorge to Queenston. This would add an additional 500,000 horse power, and as I understand it, this could be increased to 800,000 horsepower if greater diversions are allowed during night time and during the winter months.

However, with respect to the labour problem, some few months ago, there was a premature announcement made in regard to the Niagara Development, and, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, in less than one week we had 200 fellows drift in there looking for work. We had two carloads along from the Province of Manitoba. They thought the project had already started, and the result was until we could get them to see differently, we had to take care of those 200 gentlemen.

Last Monday morning when this project seemed to break, I had six different men in the office, wanting a recommendation for work, and I know as well as I am talking here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow morning there will be at least 50 or 60 fellows looking for work.

I would appreciate it if the hon. Vice-Chairman (Mr. Challies) would consider some way to protect our district in that regard. We are not selfish in any respect, we know this is a provincial project, and I am not demanding that every Niagara Falls resident gets a job on that project,

but, until it is actually ready to start, I would appreciate it if we could have some protection for men who are going to drift down there continually. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, we have not got an empty house in Niagara Falls, and we have hardly a vacant lot to start building a new house on, so if married men come down, I want to warn them, Mr. Speaker, there is no place to take care of them at all.

The action of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) in accordance with his recent announcement concerning grants for educational purposes perhaps is a worthwhile one and the intention is to provide, as I understand, assistance in those cases where it is most urgently needed, but I do think that a little more consideration should have been given to urban municipalities, particularly those of lower populations. Their educational costs have risen in the same ratio or proportion as they have in any locality, and by virtue of the fact that they are smaller in population and assessment valuation, the financing is a critical problem. Education must improve and expand, but there also should be some further assistance to such municipalities in order that the desired improvement and expansion can be taken care of.

We were quite heartened, Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter) when we first received your "score card" in regard to grants, but after the Board of Education worked over them, we found we were going to receive $1,800. less than we had last year, so I hope some consideration will be forthcoming.

The federal government, according to recent announcement, has finally realized that something in the way of financial assistance should be provided for municipalities

where a government institution or buildings are located, and which are presently exempt from taxation, and in accordance with the publicity, they intend to make grants in lieu of taxation, but have attached a string to the affect that the assessed valuations must not be in excess of four percent. of the total taxation assessment before any such assistance is provided. This is a recognition of the need, but is far from adequate assistance, and I feel that the string should be removed, and that each municipality wherein governmental properties are located should be considered individually and assistance granted accordingly. Very frequently operations of major governments are carried on in a municipality in competition with private operations and the fact that the governmental operations are exempt from taxation is in effect a subsidization and unfair competition.

We in Niagara Falls alone, Mr. Speaker, have over $11,000,000. worth of property which is free from assessment, and something has got to be done about it.

These are only a few of the problems confronting us as a municipality.

I firmly believe that the growing costs of services which are apart from basic municipal services, have created an unfair form of taxation at the municipal level, and it is our problem today, and is a problem of all governments that they should not do away with services essential to the well-being of all its citizens, but to see to it that the costs of these services are levied on the most equitable basis; that, I think, Mr. Speaker, is a task common to all the hon. members of this Legislature.

A r 'mission to the Cabinet was made on behalf of all the municipalities of the Province of Ontario, and may I mention four of them: first, relief to municipalities of all costs of social services so that such costs will be provided from a source of taxation equitably levied at provincial and federal levels.

Second: A further re-adjustment of the basis of provincial grants which will permit of sound fiscal planning by municipalities.

Third: A curtailment of exemption from municipal taxation including properties of the federal and provincial governments so that municipal services will be paid for on the same basis as applies to owners of homes and real property.

Fourth: Assumption by the federal and provincial governments of the cost of administration of justice.

Child welfare costs have increased very considerably in the last few years. The costs of this institutional care have likewise increased, and the costs of welfare administration have continued at a high level even through a period of almost full employment.

One of the major contributing factors of grave concern in the experience of municipalities is that of unemployment relief, which has compelled municipalities to deplete their revenues to contribute to relief of unemployed persons with a corresponding degree in proper municipal services. I firmly believe that the provindial and federal governments with their large fields of taxation are in a position to assume the cost of social services, education and justice. We, in the municipalities, seek and appreciate

the co-operation of the higher levels of governments to furnish additional sources of revenue to provide municipal services. The burden of municipal taxation is becoming much too heavy for the property owner to bear.

I want to compliment the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) today on his statement concerning coal. Being not only the Mayor of a municipality, but happening to be in the coal business myself, Mr. Speaker, I know whereof the hon. Premier has spoken, and so well spoken. People do become panicky in a time like this, and they do not mean to be dishonest, but they are prone to be shaky about the fuel situation, and will do all sorts of stunts or tricks in order to get more coal. One of the coal dealers in Niagara Falls was telling me a week or so ago that a lady called him and said they were absolutely out of fuel. Most of us have instructed our men to search the cellar when they arrive. This lady's coal bin was empty, but she had 25 bags of coal stored in the fruit cellar, and thought she would get the coal which was delivered to her that day.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Must have been a Tory.

MR. HOUCK: But if the people will co-operate, there is no reason for fright or for a coal shortage either, so I do appreciate, Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost), the interest you are taking in the coal situation.

I think another question that this government as well as the federal government should be well interested in is to take some consideration of the number of people that are leaving Canada and the Province of Ontario to live in the United States.

The statistics on the movement of population from Canada to the United States are interesting. During the fiscal year ended June 30th, 1948, a total of 22,522 Canadians obtained permanent United States immigration visas, permitting them to live in the States. During the first nine months of the current fiscal year, 17,067 Canadians moved to the United States to take up permanent residence and the total reached 25,000 in June.

No less interesting are the figures on the movement of Americans to take up permanent residence in this country. In 1945, a total of 4,833 Americans took the first step toward becoming permanent Canadian citizens. In 1946, the number reached 9,254, and in 1947, a total of 10,757 Americans moved to Canada. In 1948, 8,505 obtained Canadian visas.

Whatever motives may actuate individuals in one country in deciding to live in the other, whether it be quest of greater opportunity or merely a conviction that the grass on the other side of the fence is greener, it is apparent that this mutual migration is one of the best ways of promoting goodwill and better understanding between the peoples of the two nations. Each person participating in this movement of population may rightly consider himself an envoy of his own country to the other, interpreting its views and customs.

May I say a word before closing pertaining to the Royal Commission on Education. Certainly, Mr. Premier (Mr.Frost), you must consider it a disgrace to the people of this Province that a Commission should be in operation for almost now five years, and I can only refer back to a

statement made by the Chairman of the Royal Commission on May 28th, 1937, at a banquet at Niagara Falls, and I quote from our local newspaper of the night after the banquet: "The eminent jurist announced that the Royal Commission on Education hopes to produce a completed report by the end of this year. He promised that the report will not simply apply a coat of whitewash on the existing framework." That statement was given almost three years ago.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, when I referred to this Commission, I suggested that they must be on a "slow boat to China", which was a popular song at that time, and now I can only ask the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) to take the words of the pupular Mule Train Song, where the driver is shouting "get along", and suggest that he tells this Commission to get along and out of the picture completely.

I would like to make this further suggestion, Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost), that you have appointed a very fine commission this last year, which I think is doing a very worthwhile job, the Conservation Committee, and if you will dismiss this Royal Commission on Education and turn it over to the Committee, we will probably have a report within a very few months, and we will have action on it.

All we have heard so far from the Royal Commission on Education is a gun-shot report from the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), who pulled the trigger before it was supposed to go off.

May I just say this, Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost), that I am not only speaking as a group, but I think it is the concensus of opinion of all the people of this Province that

we do appreciate your splendid co-operation with the Government at Ottawa. Naturally, when our own Premier co-operates with the government at Ottawa, it is a true saying that democracy is still at work, and because of your splendid co-operation with the federal government, the municipalities as well, I am sure, will benefit.

Last summer on June 19th, our Greater Niagara Chamber of Commerce started to issue honeymoon certificates to honeymooners who were in Niagara Falls. Naturally, we do not get all of them. The only ones we receive are those registered at one or two of the main hotels, or who go to the Chamber of Commerce direct. In less than 8 months, we have issued almost 2,700 of these certificates.

May I say in passing that we have had a special certificate prepared with gold lettering all the way through and a much finer preparation than the other certificates, which will be held in waiting for the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett). I extended a cordial invitation to him last year, and so far he has not taken advantage of it. I think at that time I promised to compliment the bridal suite -

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): The General Brock.

MR. HOWCK: Yes, to the General Brock, and now, Mr. Speaker, as Mayor, I have the authority to tell him that if he will come there on his wedding trip, I will have one of those wedding certificates, as they say, "blown up", enlarged and lettered with gold lettering, and I will declare a civic holiday at the same time.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: You might pick a bride for him too.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Will you invite the hon. members of the Legislature down?

MR. HOUCK: I could not look after it all myself, I would have to have help.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): You have lovely girls in Niagara Falls.

MR. HOUCK: We have the finest girls in the Province of Ontario.

MR. SALSBERG: How do you know?

MR. HOUCK: And my wife is the finest, believe me.

Americans and Canadians living near their common boundary are too often inclined to take their advantages for granted. Vacationists and tourists on each side find access to the other country easy and the mutual acquaintances made are producing better understanding and goodwill. But in the interior or the southern part of the United States, as in the interior and northern part of Canada, there is less frequent opportunity for mutual association of the two peoples. It is there that those who become permanent residents of either country play an important role. American farmers go to live in the Western provinces of Canada. Others move to Canadian cities to teach or to act as branch representatives of industries. Canadians seeking warmer climates go far south of the border. Those seeking to pursue professions or searching for opportunities in business in America go to live in cities or towns. In these areas remote from the international border, the persons moving to either country become really important unofficial envoys, as they exchange views with the residents of their new communities.

May I express, Mr. Speaker, in closing the hope that the organization of democratic forces in this country will not merely fall apart because a victory has been won by any political party in a single election. The battle for democracy is like the battle for liberty, it requires eternal vigilance.

Our principles of democracy through a long and glorious history have represented and achieved enough for the welfare of the Canadian people to justify continuous and co-ordinating co-operation on behalf of all our people in or out of office to keep the light forever burning which points the way to progress and to solid achievement of Canada and Ontario and everything for which we stand.

Mr. Speaker, might I say I fully believe, and I know all hon. members of this House have utmost confidence, that the next 50 years of this world belongs to the Dominion of Canada. With the ability we have attained, with our natural resources, with the advancement of science -- and the intelligence in order to take care of that science and develop it properly -- I think Canada and the Province of Ontario face a bright future, and no matter what the world holds in the future, I think in a very few short years we can throw back our shoulders and throw out our chests in order to justify the pride we all have in being adherents to the Dominion of Canada, and especially the Province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate on behalf of the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Dempsey).

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, may I say on Monday it is our intention to go ahead with Government Orders, and if possible, we would like to continue the Throne Debate, at least if there is an opportunity and sufficient time without rushing other things. We intend to that because I would like to give hon. members of this House ample opportunity to take part in this debate. We have heard this afternoon three very able addresses from three hon. members representing three different parties in this House, and I am sure hon. members will agree, Mr. Speaker, that all of those contributions were very worthy, and quite up to any of the standards which have been set in this honourable Legislature. I think we want to make it possible for our hon. private members particularly to have the fullest opportunity in this regard, and therefore if it is possible we would like, as we did this afternoon, to work in some Throne addresses. The Whips of the various parties can make arrangements accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper the Bill which probably would evoke the greatest interest at the moment is the Labour Bill. I am sure it is not our intention, Mr. Speaker, to hurry that matter. We had thought perhaps of bringing it up on Monday, but the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) thinks that might be a little soon, and if we are able to include some Throne addresses on Monday, we might come to that order, perhaps, on Tuesday. In any event, whenever the Bill is called, hon. members of the House may be assured it is not our intention to rush that Bill either in second reading or in Committee. We will take

plenty of time and see what has to be said, and what suggestions are made in connection with it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4:40 o'clock p.m.

A-1

Volume 13.

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS SIXTH DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT THREE O'CLOCK P. M.

/ / / / / / /
- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario,
Monday, March 6 , 1950,
3.00 o'clock, p.m.

/ / / / / / /
- - - - - - -

3.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that the name of Mr. Leavens be added to the members of the Committee on Fish and Game. I understand the hon. member's(Mr. Leavens) name was omitted, and he wanted to be on that committee, so we added his name.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

CITY OF TORONTO

MR. CHARLES REAS (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Cathcart, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the city of Toronto", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE INSURANCE ACT

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York, West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Wismer, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Insurance Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE MOTHERS ALLOWANCES ACT

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL(York, East): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Millard, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Mother Allowances Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

(1) The Annual Report of the Department of Highways for the province of Ontario, for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1949.

(2) The Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board, for the year 1949.

HON. LESLIE M. FRASER (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 10, 21 and 47.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. HARRY C. NIXON (Brant); Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have an important matter to bring to your attention, and one in which I am sure all the hon. members of the House will be greatly interested. Not only is this matter important, but it is a very pleasant matter to deal with, and one which I assure you will not be controversial.

That pleasant matter, Mr. Speaker, is to do honour and extent congratulations to one of the senior hon. members of the House on the occasion of his birthday.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: Need I add, Mr. Speaker, that in this, I am referring to my good friend, the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver).

Any hon. member who consults the parliamentary guide will learn that the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver) was born on March 6th, 1904, so I am divulging no secret in this regard. He was first elected to this House in 1926 at the very early age of twenty-two years, which I think

constituted a record for a great many years, until the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott) came in and broke the record by one year, in the last election.

The hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver) has been elected at every subsequent election, and has held important Cabinet posts in three different governments. He has been Leader of the Opposition, has sat as an Independent, and what future honours this House has to give him, I will not attempt to prophecy on this occasion, as I intimated this matter is entirely non-controversial.

I have known the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) since the day he came into the House, and have had the highest regard and greatest respect for him, and have highly appreciated the warm personal friendship which has existed down through the years.

He has now been a member of this Legislature for twenty-four years. One more year, Mr. Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) and he will be eligible for the Quarter Century Club --

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): And the pension that goes with it?

MR. NIXON: Like myself, also eligible, but I regret to say that our membership, Mr. Speaker, was sadly depleted on the occasion of the last election.

From the first, the hon. member, our good friend from Grey, South (Mr.Oliver) has proven himself to be an able debater, and, as I have pointed out, has discharged with great credit to himself the heavy responsibilities of this Legislature. He has never hesitated to take his part and state his stand on all issues, and at times in a very emphatic way

and in fact, if I may borrow one of his own expressions, in the twenty-four years he has been in this Legislature, there have been few indeed in this House who could "outlung" him.

But, notwithstanding that, with his kindly, personal nature and genuine warmth of friendship to all hon. members, he has been, without exception, one of the most popular hon. members of the House, in all these different Legislatures in which he has represented the riding of Grey.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we in this groups are particularly proud to follow his leadership, as I am sure are all Liberals throughout the province of Ontario, and nothing would make us happier than to have him continue in this capacity indefinitely.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: I can truthfully say that the happiest experiences of my life in this House have been under his very able and most acceptable leadership. However, these are matters for him to decide personally, and I am sure he has many years of service in this Legislature before him, as he is still a comparatively young man, but, as I have said, who knows what the future may hold for him? In any case, I am very sure, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. members will join with me in extending to the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver) my hearty congratulations and wish for him and his good wife the very best in health and happiness for many years to come.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy indeed to join in extending today to the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver) my own felicitations, and those of all hon. members in this corner of the

House. He is, I think, very highly regarded as a man and a member of this House, in all quarters. Some of us have had the privilege of enjoying his company as a travelling companion, and we can testify what a good travelling companion he is, whether it be on land, on the water, or in the air.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): A fewllOw traveller?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I might add, whether we are travelling with him, or whether we are sitting with him in this House, we can all agree that the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) whether physically, intellectually, or spiritually, carries a great deal of weight, and I think he always will.

We wish him many happy returns of the day.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we will all want to join in the congratulations extended by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) seconded, if I may put it that way, by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) to our good friend the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver).

As the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) said, he was born at Priceville, on the 6th of March, 1904, and, therefore, can say that he has spent more than half of his lifetime as an hon. member of this House. That is quite an achievement. I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) perhaps can say the same thing. I do not know whether our good friend from Peel, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) while a veteran of this House, can say the same, that is, that he has been an hon. member of this House for more than half of his lifetime. However, I want to join in wishing the hon.

member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver) the very best for health and happiness for himself and his wife, and we hope that he may enjoy good health for many years to come. That does not particularly apply, Mr. Speaker, to his political health. Perhaps I can put it in this way, that he may be spared for many years to be the Leader of the Liberal Opposition.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: We wish him many, many happy returns.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, what has been said up to now has been so well said that I can almost content myself with the word "amen".

My colleague (Mr. Salsberg) and I, however, do desire to join with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in congratulating the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver) on the attainment of his forty-sixth birthday.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has pointed out that he has achieved a unique position, having sat in the House continuously for twenty-four years. That is an achievement, In fact, I can almost say it is an ordeal as well, to have sat through what he has sat through during that period of time, having regard to the number of Tory governments we have had in Ontario during that twenty-four years.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do feel that the record of the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver) must be unique in the annals of British parliamentary institutions. I doubt very much if we would find another case of a man coming into the House at the tender years of twenty-two, and remaining in

the House continuously for the length of time that the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver) has sat here.

We, in our little island home over here, have a very deep respect for the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver), and we hold him in very high esteem and in deep affection.

We fully share the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) that after the convention -- whether it be held in April, June or October -- it will have produced the happy result for which the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has expressed a desire.

As for what will happen after the mantle of leadership has been draped around his shoulders for a second time, I can only say:

"I do not ask to see the distance scene; one step enough for me".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey, South): Well, Mr. Speaker, there are few occasions when I find it difficult to speak. I think this is one of the few occasions when words are hard to find and hard to blend with others to make something that is meaningful.

I want to express my thanks to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and to my good friend, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and my friend, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) for the very kind words they have uttered today in commemorating my forty-sixth birthday.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there are days throughout the year one looks forward to, even when you are in the forties. You like to see Christmas come, and the other holidays, but

there is one day you would set back if you had the power, and that is your birthday. If this Legislature had the power, I would ask them to pass a Bill saying that birthdays would not be annual, but bi-annual, and that would save us a good many years over the course of a lifetime.

It has been mentioned here this afternoon that I have had long experience in public life. For a quarter of a century I have been in public life for the province of Ontario, and as one looks back over that long span of time, I think one feels when that condition has been attained, that there have been many things which have been worthwhile.

I always like to feel that one of the great compensations of public life is the friends you make as you go along the road. If it were not for those lasting friendships made over the years, and carried through from one year to another, political life would lose one of its greatest allurements, as far as I am concerned.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not know how word of this forty-sixth anniversary got around today. I certainly did not spread the news, and I did not know what my friend, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) had on his desk in the shape of notes until he rose to speak. I thought perhaps he was preparing a blast at the administration over some deserving piece of fumbling which they have done in their legislative record.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: These remarks being spontaneous are all the more welcome, should I say, and I feel the more deeply on that account.

I do appreciate the kind words, and I hope that as the

days go on, we will be able to contribute much, working together, for the good of this province. I have always tried, in public life, to reach the high ambition and the coveted prize of being a good public servant. If you are not able to get your hands on that coveted prize, you will at least have done much in that you tried to reach that attainment and your goal. I think that goes for all hon. members in this House. No matter to which party we belong, we want to be good public servants; we want to be good representatives of the people back home, and as we go forward in our desire to that end, we will write on the statute books of this province legislation which will be benefit to the mass of the people of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: So to that good work I dedicate whatever remains to me of political life. I do not know whether I could answer the query by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod); I do not know that I can reassure my good friend, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) in the words they spoke this afternoon. Time has a great faculty of taking care of these things, and as the months go on, we will be able to see the picture with more clarity, and determine the future with less guessing than is possible at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker before the Orders of the Day are called, I think the House would wish to be informed of the bereavement over the weekend of our good friend and colleague, the hon. member for Cochrane, South (Mr. Grummett). His father, Mr. John Grummett, passed

away, I believe, on Friday evening. He had, I understand, attained his ninetieth year, and must have been one of the oldest residents of Grey County, where the hon. member for Cochrane, South (Mr. Grummett) was born fifty-nine years ago. He was one of the "old timers" of western Ontario, and I am sure the sympathies of the House will go out to the hon. member for Cochrane, South (Mr. Grummett) in the loss he has suffered.

(Take B follows)

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I am sure we all join the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in his expression of sympathy. We are deeply sorry for the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) in the loss he has sustained. He has this, however -- he can certainly look over a great span of years he had with his father who was ninety years of age. We certainly all extend to the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) our deepest sympathy.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey, South): I join with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in his expression of sympathy to the hon. member for Cochrane, South (Mr. Grummett). Mr. Grummett, Sr. was in our riding all his life. He was a power in South Grey. He belonged to a family of great pioneers and he brought into this world a family that will continue his good.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Colleague and I are desirous to be associated in the expressions of sympathy to the hon. member for Cochrane, South (Mr. Grummett) in the loss of his father.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 1.

THE PUBLIC OFFICERS FEES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, third reading of Bill No. 64, "An Act to amend the Public Officers' Fees Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 64, "An Act to amend the Public Officers' Fees Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass,

be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE INSURANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 66, "An Act to amend the Insurance Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 66, "An Act to amend the Insurance Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

THE MAGISTRATES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 67, "An Act to amend the Magistrates Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): I move the third reading of Bill No. 67, "An Act to amend the Magistrates Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: Order. No. 64.

THE REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 69, "An Act to amend the Real Estate and Business Brokers Act", Mr. Porter.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 70, "An Act to amend the School Attendance Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER: I move third reading of Bill No. 70, "An Act to amend the School Attendance Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

THE AUXILIARY CLASSES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, third reading of Bill No. 71, "An Act to amend the Auxiliary Classes Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): I move third reading of Bill No. 71, "An Act to amend the Auxiliary Classes Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 36.

THE GAME AND FISHERIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-sixth Order, second reading of Bill No. 84, "An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act, 1946," Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Hold that one back.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 37.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-seventh Order, second reading of Bill No. 85, "An Act to amend the Agricultural Societies Act,

1939", Mr. Kennedy.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): I move second reading of Bill No. 85, "An Act to amend the Agricultural Societies Act, 1939".

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): The hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) was absent when it was introducted.

MR. KENNEDY: This is an Act that puts into legal form what we are doing with buildings at Sairs. At Ottawa, three years ago, they passed an Act giving one-third of the capital costs on certain buildings at certain fairs, and we give one-third, on condition that the municipality take charge of the other third. In London, Ottawa, Kingston, the lakehead, Simcoe, this is being done. And this just means putting it into legal form.

Motion agreed to;second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 38.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-eighth Order, second reading of Bill No. 86, "An Act to amend the Milk Control Act," Mr. Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY: I move the second reading of Bill No. 86, "An Act to amend the Milk Control Act".

This is only to change the vote of 75 per cent to 66 per cent when an agency is required to handle services, and also clarifies the limits to which adistributor may have to go to get his licence and explains the power of the board in connection with examinations.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Are there any agencies now?

MR. KENNEDY: No. Ask me a week from today and I may say yes. We have a vote of 90.2 per cent which came in on Friday.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Bill No. 86 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee; Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 25.

THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ACT, 1948.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fifth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 63, "An Act to amend the Housing Development Act, 1948", Mr. Griesinger.

(Page B-6 follows)

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): When the committee was at Ottawa there was some discussion of the intention and policies which were embraced in this Bill, and particularly embraced in subsection 5-A. That is to say whether the intention is to concentrate on the acquisition of land and material or the acquisition and development of land for housing, and their construction for rent. The difficulty of this kind of section is it vests in the government a very wide discretion as to the kind of agreement it will enter into with the dominion government.

That was gone into more seriously at the parliament in Ottawa, because the federal House meets for a large part of the year and this House does not.

I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) would be good enough to indicate more specifically and more clearly than he did the other day whether he proposes to enter into an agreement with the Dominion, with a view to the construction of houses for rent in a large way, or does he intend to put emphasis on housing for sale? That is one question. And I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) should answer it.

MR. GRIESINGER: In replying to the Opposition, I might say that at the present time we are in the midst of negotiation with the federal government, trying for a pilot or enabling agreement between the two. It is difficult to say at the present time what the form will take, whether for sale or a great deal for rent.

We have at the present time ten applications from ten groups in the province, some for rental , the majority were asking for cheap houses for sale. As to what form

on which we will commence these operations, it is difficult to say. We might say we are the lead-horse in this. We are the leadhorse with the different municipalities, and the Corporation is the work-horse. When we get this drawn up, and after negotiating with the municipalities, the ten different municipalities, we will be in a better position to say what type will be built.

It is our intention to go ahead as fast as possible and give the type of house that the different municipalities have asked for, the different types that they desire to have.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It would not be fair to look into the future, but when you institute negotiations, you have some objective, and this objective cannot be continually nebulous. The hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) stated he had proposals from certain municipalities, some for construction of houses for selling and some for rental projects. I am asking the hon. Minister to tell us his objective. I know he has both types in mind. The hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) says we are taking the part of the lead-horse. It has to be, because we are dealing with the dominion and the municipalities.

Being the lead-horse, there must be a clear objective as to where we are going. Did the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) propose to Ottawa, to the utmost of his powers, the construction of rental housing?

MR. GRIESINGER: It depends entirely on what type the municipality wants. We will co-operate in any way we can on the type they want in that community.

We have had several municipalities who are interested

in different houses, who desire a house that can be built at a reasonable price at the lowest down payment. They are not at the present time interested in rental. We have applications from other communities who are not interested in rental housing. We cannot say now how many rental houses can be built. We are co-operating with the municipalities.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): In this Bill, Mr. Minister, is it intended that the municipality is to assume any of the cost, the main cost and the sidewalks on the street?

MR. GRIESINGER: There is a possibility. Any municipal corporation, where a project is undertaken can contribute to any monies. Some municipalities may not be able to bear any of the cost. Others may assemble the land and help in effecting the services. It is a question that each municipality has to be dealt with individually.

We have made no agreement at the present time, and it is difficult to say what form each municipality will take.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): In view of the fact that the rights of many people will be affected by this Bill, the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) should be in a position to give to the House some of the primary plans. Especially in view of what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said that it was desirable that there should be modest units for those of the low-salary bracket.

The answer to some of the questions on the Paper, gives the average second mortgage as $1,058., and the average first mortgage as $6,476., bringing the total indebtedness to $7,535. Also the down payment before taking

on the mortgage was $1,250., making a total figure of $8,786. for the home.

That cannot be classed as a low-cost home.

What the people of Ontario would like is that the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) should give his intention of what he feels is a low-cost home, give his indication of a low-cost home, and also what, for this year, would be the interest rate.

We want the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) to indicate what the low-cost house project would be in this municipality, and if the people could pay for them in small rental payments.

I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) should be prepared to give the House some idea of the plans and what is going to be done to carry them into effect.

MR. GRIESINGER: I may say that at the present time there is a contractor who hopes to build houses costing $5,800. I do not think you can get lower. And there, again, the financing with the $580. down, $580. down-payment, or ten percent. You have to appreciate that insofar as this government is concerned, we are twenty-five percent. partners with the Dominion government in the housing scheme. They are responsible for the type of homes that can be erected. We use their plans and we try out the agreements with the municipalities, and use their set-up. There will be no duplication set-up as far as we are concerned.

With houses at $5,800., and with $580. down payment, I am sure that in London the housing situation there could be taken care of in fast order. It is something that has to be worked out on the basis of trial and error. I can

say for my statement on the second reading, this second reading, this government paid out $19,500,000., and I see no reason why we should not do the same under the new agreement.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): This action by the joint governments, contractors have been assured that the cost would be supplied by the dominion government at 75 percent. to 25 percent. Do I assume now that for these housing contractors, that they are bound to make further contributions in the way of supplying services, or are they going to be eliminated entirely from the need of subsidizing units other than municipal taxation? Is it going to be additional, and supply services before entering into any contracts for homes?

MR. GRIESINGER: No, no.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) with reference to these $5,800. houses, is that a frame or a brick house?

MR. GRIESINGER: I cannot answer that.

MR. SALSBERG: I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) that, because in Toronto the building rules would prohibit the building of anything but brick, stone and cement -- fire-proof houses.

(Page B-11 Follows)

If there is a frame house it would be useless for a municipality such as ours.

MR. J. S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew South): I have had experience with a few houses. We build a substantial house for $5800.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Frame?

MR. DEMPSEY: No. Brick and with hardwood floors and good lighting. It is a good house. And I was not there all the time or it might have been cheaper. I was away looking afterother business. It could have been done cheaper. We had a very good house. One room upstairs, two bedrooms downstairs and a big living room and toilet.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Will the Housing Corporation have the authority to do business with the individual or just withthe municipality? If the municipality acquires land and subdivides into 100 lots and provides services and it is turned over to the connetr ctor , we have no guarantee that the contractors will sell it to the consumers at a much greater price than anticipated. We have had experience of veterans giving less than $1 for lots and these lots were taken over by the contractors who promised to seel them to the veteran and in the end they could not get any better deal than the man on the street. And we deal direct with the individual building his own home?

And again, have the municipalities endeavored to set up classes similar to the D. V. A.? There are classes set up whereby the veterans are being instructed in the building of their own homes. That is one way people can cut down by doing their own work and perhaps financing as they go on.

MR. GRIESINGER: We are not involved in individual house building. That sort of building is still to be maintained through the National Housing Corporation. We are only interested in projects.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Municipal projects?

MR. GRIESINGER: Yes. But under the recent amendments when we are discussing the price of houses you will have, if it were financed under the Natinnal Housing Act, they have the right to set the end price. We have no responsibility in that. We are only involved in the projects.

MR. THORNBERRY: How about classes being set up by the municipalities, instructional classes?

MR. GRIESINGER: We would have nothing to do with that. I believe they are carried out in some other communities now.

MR. THORNBERRY: They are also conducting a shhool where they will instruct the citizens in building their own homes and to help inbuilding their own homes.

MR. GRIESINGER: It is a possibility that we may take part inthat when we have our enabling agreement with the Federal government. We are working on that.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Do you mean that itis to extend to the ordinary citizen?

MR. THORNBERRY: Yes.

MR. FROST: There is merit in that.

MR. THORNBERRY: It would give to the public a great opportunity to learn the building trade. Would you try to make that arrangement?

MR. GRIESINGER: We will certainly keep it in mind.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Could we have more elucidation. The Minister will make his agreement with the Dominion and on the other hand there would be the municipality. The municipality will acquire certain land under a scheme by virtue of which houses will be built, and I assume that many of them or perhaps all of them will be built by private builders. Is that correct?

MR. GRIESINGER: We have every intention to encourage it.

We do not wish to interfere with private enterprise.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Some timesyou have to. I think some explanation should be given so as to safeguard the people against something similar tothe Pelmo Park affair. We must have some supervision. There must be some protection for all people as well as for the owner. There must be protection against inefficiency or dishonesty, which sometimes inthe past led to the loss of the down payment. What safeguards will be there set up?

MR. GRIESINGER: The set up of the Central Mortgage Corporation will look after any house involved. They inspect every house for financing.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They did that at Pelmo Park.

MR. GRIESINGER: Pelmo Park has nothing to do with this Act.

MR. T ORNBERRY: There are going to be more Pelmo Parksif there are no safeguards provided. What safeguard willthere be for the protection of the public for the type of thing that has occurred at least once.

MR. GRIESINGER: We have the facilities of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation behind us and we will make every attempt to see a builder doesnot go over his head and build more houses than he can finance. In the othercase, if he had built ten he would have been all right. It is our intention to protect everyone as far as possible.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What possibilities are there today for inspection which represent any improvement over the facilities at the time of the Pelmo Park? Has there been any lessons learned?

MR. GRIESINGER: Yes. Because these advances to private contractors are not made at one time, they are not all made at one time. There may be no such rush again.

(Take C follows)

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): Mr. Chairman, could we proceed with this Pelmo Park just a little further? Our firm acted for the people who lost all their life's savings in that disaster, and when the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) states they are relying on the facilities of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, that simply is not good enough. The difficulty in Pelmo Park was --

MR. GRIESINGER: That has nothing to do with this Act.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Yes, it has. They are related.

MR. GRIESINGER: What we are discussing is quite different from the situation in Pelmo Park.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): We are asking you for some kind of safeguard for those who are going to purchase these homes. The difficulty in the Pelmo Park's collapse was that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation never actually checked the homes, they left it up to Canada Life, the insurance company, and people who purchased homes were deluded into thinking it had been checked by a government agency, when actually such a thing had never happened.

I read the Pelmo Park inquiry through when it came out -- the report of the Judge who investigated it,-- and the chief objection seems to have been Kershaw could never have made any money, even in the beginning, because he actually under-estimated the cost of the homes. On later checking up, the experts in that inquiry stated that Kershaw was doomed to failure even in the beginning because no government agency, or no responsible agency, had ever checked the estimates that Kershaw submitted to the prospective purchasers,

with the result that from the very beginning these people were doomed to lose their life's savings.

What I want to know, therefore, is: are you going to set up any kind of government agency to somehow check the estimates that private builders submit on the cost of these homes? That is actually what happened in the case of Kershaw, he under-estimated the entire cost of the project because of his inexperience, with these results, that from the very beginning the whole project was doomed. Are you going to do anything to correct that in future, under agreements of this kind?

MR. GRIESINGER: I am sure, Mr. Chairman, we will not become involved in the type of housebuilding Kershaw was involved in. That is a conventional type of financing, which is under Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and insofar as this Bill is concerned, we are involved in project building. If we go into some community, and it is decided to build 400 houses, those 400 houses will be built by contract by sub-contractors. We do not have anything to do with individual building, insofar as Kershaw or the Pelmo Park project was concerned. We are involved in projects of 100, 200, 300 or 400 houses, as the case may be, and if anybody is cheated, it is Central Mortgage and the Provincial Government.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): That is right.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): That depends how it is done, Mr. Chairman. Who will make the sale to the home-owner after you have participated in the project? After you have made your agreement, after the municipality has acquired the land, after a contract is undertaken to

build on that land, who makes the sale to the prospective purchaser?

MR. FROST: That, Mr. Chairman, would depend upon the type of authority, whether there is a housing authority, whether it is the municipality, or whether it is Central Mortgage.

As was explained on second reading, the type of authority depends on the circumstances in each municipality. Now, as I see it, if anybody loses money, supposing there was a private builder and he went bad, it would be up to us use discretion to see that advances were not made to him beyond the value of the work. That happens in building every day of the week, and I do not think there would be any difficulty in that.

I can assure you of this, that we will be sufficiently tough with the contractors so that we will not lose any money.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): You cannot be tough with private enterprise.

MR. FROST: And if we do, we will be the losers, it will not be the general public.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mention has been made of a figure of $5,800., and the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) speaks of projects of 400 homes. Let us suppose in a municipality, private builders or private enterprise undertakes to build 400 homes at $5,800., and the project is set up and the prospective buyers put down their down payments of $580., or as low as it might. Then, supposing the private builder gets the roof on and he finds he has under-estimated and cannot complete the home for $5,800., and he walks off the job, who is going to protect the purchaser?

MR. FROST: Oh, I think, Mr. Chairman, in these projects there is no possibility of that situation arising, for the reason that this is a partnership between the Dominion, the Province and the municipalities. We think the municipalities will be very small partners, but nevertheless, they are important from the standpoint of the management and the sale of the houses. I think I can give you every assurance that if any contractor short-changes anybody, he does not short-change purchasers, because the purchasers will be dealing with either of the partners, and there is no possibility there will be losses incurred.

I can see this, that in connection with other housing projects, where perhaps some private contractor is engaged under The Housing Act, and things we have nothing to do with, there may be, but not in this low-cost type housing at all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But, Mr. Chairman, that does not quite strike the point. It is not a matter of being subject to the contractor. That is not really the point. Many a good businessman has failed, and there may be one thousand and one reasons for failure. The question is, from whom will the sale be made?

Now, granting that the municipality and the province and the Dominion may have --

MR. FROST: I think my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) will agree with this, that the purchaser in connection with these housing projects will never deal with the contractor directly, he will deal with the housing authority or with the representative of the partnership. That is who he will deal with.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That answers it.

MR. FROST: Yes, that answers it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If that will always be the case, that is the answer.

MR. FROST: Yes. Under this type of housing, certainly, and if anybody loses any money, if a contractor goes broke, why of course the partnership will lose, and the house will have to be completed, and that will come into the 75/25 propositions, and Mr. Jones who buys the house will buy it free of encumbrances and without any loss at all.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, would that mean that the prospective purchaser would be allowed to, in effect, buy a house, and pay the down payment on the basis of the original estimate?

MR. FROST: Oh, I would think so, certainly. I do not think that in a project, supposing something like that happened, and there was a loss in that way, that we ought to charge it back to these people. I think we had better write it off and forget about it if we had that sort of thing.

MR. WISMER: Mr. Chairman, one more other point: there was mention of a possibility in London -- I understand one place where this may develop in its early stage -- I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) mentioned a figure, that if houses of a type relatively satisfactory could be built for $5,800., and the suggestion was also made that a down payment of ten percent. or $580. would be required to purchase into that project -- I am wondering if the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) could enlighten us further as to the balance of the financing, from the standpoint of the purchaser, how big a house is it, how much of a monthly payment would be required to pay for the house?

MR. GRIESINGER: I did not get the last part.

MR. WISMER: Well, is it a four, five or six-roomed house for $5,800., and how will the balance of $5,220. be financed over the years?

MR. GRIESINGER: There will be so much a month. The house will be amortized. We do not know exactly at the present time just what this enabling agreement with the Dominion will be worked out at.

MR. WISMER: No idea?

MR. GRIESINGER: It is going to be trial and error all the way through.

MR. WISMER: Is there some target on the interest rate?

MR. GRIESINGER: Well, the target is to try to get the down payment to the lowest possible point, and a monthly payment.

MR. WISMER: What about the interest rate?

MR. GRIESINGER: And there may be such a thing as there will not be a down payment, it may be a rental-purchase plan. We have got to work this out.

MR. WISMER: I agree you have to work the thing out, but surely there is an interest rate on the amortization. I wondered what the interest rate might be, or what target you are trying to reach.

MR. GRIESINGER: It all depends on the arrangements we make.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Are we to understand that practically all the arrangements are yet to be made, because this Bill is to go into force the day it receives Royal Assent, which might be next week or the week after for all we know. I

would gather from what the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) now tells us that he is in the very early stages of discussion and consideration on the details of this matter. I mean, if he cannot tell us what the interest rate is likely to be or what the terms are likely to be, it does not sound as if the negotiations have proceeded very far.

MR. GRIESINGER: The interest rates will be the same as The National Housing Act has set up at the present time.

MR. WISMER: Four and a half?

MR. GRIESINGER: I believe that is right.

MR. THORNBERRY: Can we not get it down to two, like in the Veterans?

MR. FROST: We will do our best.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Mr. Chairman, I would like to return for a moment to the discussion on Pelmo Park. Do I understand from what you say that the government under this scheme would guarantee the purchaser against any loss in the event of collapse? Is that substantially the implication of what you have said? Under a scheme of this kind, where you are making agreements with the municipality and the Dominion government, am I to understand that in the event one of these building schemes collapses, the purchaser is guaranteed or indemnified against the loss of his down payment, or against the loss of any money that he has put into the scheme?

MR. GRIESINGER: With the building schemas that we are in, they cannot lose, but I cannot say that where a private contractor may build 50 houses, the same as they did in Pelmo Park, they will be guaranteed against loss. I cannot answer that, because we are not involved in those kind of

schemes.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): That is exactly the point that Pelmo Park brings out, that Kershaw did try to build 100 houses. Now that is a substantial construction scheme, probably just as substantial as many contractors under these arrangements will undertake -- 100 houses -- and he entered it upon an unbusinesslike basis, with the result the scheme collapsed. If you are not going to have any other safeguard than at present exist under Central Mortgage and Housing, then there is grave danger of other schemes collapsing just as Pelmo Park did.

I dould like to know two things; first, are you saying you are going to guarantee purchasers against losses of their life's savings in the event a scheme collapses; or, if you are not prepared to do that, what safeguards are you going to set up so there will be no more collapses similar to Pelmo Park?

MR. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is some misapprehension still about the purpose of this legislation and as to its application to the ordinary type of building scheme.

This legislation, as I understand it, is designed to permit a form of housing project which will be undertaken by the Central Mortgage Corporation, or by some local municipal housing authority, such as they have in Toronto -- they have a public housing authority set up in Toronto at the present time -- and the Central Mortgage Corporation when it becomes involved in a project, let us say, for 100 houses, will build the 100 houses and it will sell those houses to purchasers under their contract. Those purchasers

will not deal with the builder nor with the contractor who puts up the houses at all, they will simply be dealing directly with the Central Mortgage Corporation, which is a federal government corporation, and I am informed by the Central Mortgage Corporation that in cases where they have dealt with the public in any way, that they make sure the down payment is not going to be jeopardized.

Let me also point out that this legislation really follows, it is an extension in some respects of what was done over the last few years through Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, because there are a number of municipalities in this province, as has already been pointed out, which have provided for the building of houses such as in Windsor, that is one example, where they entered into this sort of thing on a fairly big scale, and there are many small municipalities that have entered into it in varying degrees, where the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation enters into a contract to build houses, and those houses are directly rented to people who are presented to them by the municipal council as being the sort of tenants they want to go into these houses. The Central Mortgage Company has been the landlord, and these people have been the tenants.

In order to provide a house at a relatively low rental, the municipality has put up the land and has supplied the services in housing projects of that kind. As I recall it, it was originally estimated that the cost of the land and the services for housing -- that was an out and out gift, it was an out and out subsidy on the part of the municipality -- providing the municipality would put up roughly $600. worth per house in the way of services, and in the way of land,

and the Central Mortgage Corporation would then build the house and rent it and collect the rents, dealing directly with the public.

It was then decided by this government two years ago that we would ease the burden of the municipality in that sort of project, and would assume half the cost to the municipality-half of the $600. That was intended to enable municipalities to go in for this sort of housing on a larger scale, if they thought it was necessary, or to ease their burden on the amount of housing they had gone into in that way.

As a result of the experience in that sort of house-building by Central Mortgage Corporation, and as a result of conferences between the federal government and this government, we have finally come to this legislation, where the Central Mortgage Corporation will continue to be active in the building of houses in projects, and in some cases they will enter into agreements with municipalities whereby they will provide houses for sale, where that is wanted, and in other cases they may do very much the same sort of thing they were doing before, they will provide houses for rent.

However, the people who live in those houses, whether they are tenants or whether they become purchasers of those houses, will deal with the Central Mortgage Corporation directly, and have nothing to do with any contractor or any builder, as in the ordinary case, at all. They are dealing with a public corporation, so I do not think there is really any question of losing any of the down payment or losing anything under the contracts insofar as the purchaser is concerned.

However, one of the other differences between this proposition and what has been done before is that the municipal contribution to these schemes of this kind will be more limited than it was before. That is another aspect.

I do not know whether I have clarified the picture or not, but I might add that as to the Pelmo Park project, that is an entirely different type of building project, and there may be something to be said for some method of dealing with a project of that kind, but that has nothing to do with this legislation, and this legislation is not designed nor is the scope of this legislation intended to deal with that sort of situation at all. That would be a matter for some entirely different type of legislation from this. This merely has to do with what might be called a form of public housing project, which will be built under this partnership arrangement between the federal government, the provincial government and the municipality, whereby the federal and provincial governments will share the major portion of the cost, and in some cases, the municipality may contribute to some very limited extent, whereby people will purchase or they will rent directly from the housing authority itself, and not from the builder, and the federal government and provincial government, under these agreements, will share any losses that occur on transactions of that kind.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I followed very carefully what the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has just said, and up to a point I agree with him, but I would now ask him to follow me very carefully as I direct his attention to the exact words which appear in the next section five-A of

sub-section one, under section one of this Bill.

This sub-section relates to agreements which may be made between the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada respecting what? Well, in the latter words, you see that an agreement may be made respecting joint projects for the construction of houses for sale or for rent, and that is what the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has just been talking about -- that is to say, he has been talking about cases where joint projects are undertaken and where the sale or renting is done to a private citizen by a municipal housing corporation, or possibly by Central Mortgage Housing.

Well, we know that the purchaser or tenant in that case is not going to be swindled, because he is doing business with a public corporation, but I direct the attention of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) to the prior words:

> "These agreements may also be made in respect of joint projects for the acquisition and development of land for housing purposes".

In other words, there is a class of project where it is contemplated that land will be acquired, it will be "assembled", I think is the word which is frequently used; the land will be acquired and assembled, and at that point the joint project ceases and the land is then made available for development by private builders, and where the land, having been assembled and acquired, is made available for building by private builders, we do come up against the problem of the builder who is unable to fulfil his contract.

We have perhaps been talking at cross purposes for a little while, but that is where the problem arises. There

is more than one class of project involved here, and I think that was made quite clear during the discussion at Ottawa.

The question which some of us have been asking is, what safeguards are you going to establish in making agreements with the municipalities, or what safeguards are you going to establish in order to protect the purchaser in the case where you have jointly assembled land, made it available for housing purposes, but the actual building is done by a private builder, because in that latter case, unless I am much misinformed, you are going to have a contract between a prospective home-owner and the builder, and the Pelmo Park problem does arise in cases of that kind.

MR. PORTER: Perhaps I can answer the hon. member's (Mr. Jolliffe) point in this way: you will note that section 35 of the National Housing Act is referred to in the subsection which is mentioned, and that the meaning and the scope of subsection one relates to the section in The National Housing Act -- Section 35.

Now section 35 of The National Housing Act -- this is the one that was passed most recently and which is referred to here -- says this:

(Page C-14 follows)

"The Corporation-----"

that is, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation---

"-----may, pursuant to agreements made between the Government of Canada and the government of any province, undertake jointly with the government of the province or any agency thereof, rojects for the acquisition and development of land for housing purposes and for the constructionof houses for sale or rent."

Then subsection 2 says:

"An agreement referred in subsection one shall provide that the capital cost of the project and the profits or losses thereon shall be shared 75 per centum by the Corporation and 25 per centum by the government of the province or an agency thereof and shall contain such otherprovisions as are considered necessary or advisable to give effect to the purposes and provisions of this section.

"And not withstanding section eighteen-----"

and so on----

"-----shall be executed on behalf of the Government of Canada by the Minister with the approval of the Governor-in-Council."

Now, as that reads, Mr. Chairman, that simply means that assembly of land is really related to a project which also involves construction of houses, there was never any suggestion that I know of whereby the government should simply assemble land and turn it over to some builder over whom they had no control.

The building of the houses under all these public building projects will be done by or through the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation or through some local authority that might be

designated by the Housing Corporation, but the purchasers or the tenants will deal directly with the public body in either buying or renting. That is the whole basis of the scheme under this legislation, as I understand it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, I hope your understanding is correct.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): One other question, before the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) sits down. How is it contemplated to supply the mortgage money, will it be the government supplying it or do you contemplate a co-mortgagee relationship with insurance companies?

MR. PORTER: The insurance companies do not come into this at all.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): They will not come into this?

MR. PORTER: No, that is right. It is government money, Federal and provincial, 75/25.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Then it is quite different from existing Central Mortgage and Housing schemes?

MR. PORTER: Quite right---with this exception, that the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the last two or three years has been building houses for rent with government money, and those housing projects, as I understand it, do not use mortgage money from mortgage companies, they use government money directly, and that has been going on, as I say, for some years and there are thousands of houses built in this way throughout the province today.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Then in a case where you are selling to a purchaser under the scheme, the mortgage money will be supplied by the government? That is correct, is it not? Not as it isnow, not in partnership with an insurance company?

MR. PORTER: Well, the insurance company is not in this at all.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): No part in it?

MR. PORTER: Not in this at all.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): I see.

MR. PORTER: The Central Mortgage Corporation will simply use government money to go out and buy the land or whatever they have to do, build the houses and then they will sell them to the purchasers and the purchasers will agree to pay so much a month.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Well, as I understand it from the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger), the actual building is going to be subcontracted out, probably to private builders. Is that correct?

MR. PORTER: Oh, well, now, I do not know what Central Mortgage and Housing is going to do about it.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Or is the government actually going into the building scheme itself?

MR. PORTER: As far as this government is concerned, I do not--

MR. B. E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): It is too much to expect.

MR. PORTER: --know that we are going to employ a lot of people to build houses.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Perish the thought.

MR. PORTER: We have no intention of doing that.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Do you know, Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter): Is the Federal Government contemplating going into the building of homes, or are these houses for sale going to be built by private builders? That is your intention, is it not?

MR. PORTER: The Housing Corporation, theCentral Mortgage Corporation have built thchouses they have built to date by entering into contracts with construction companies, in some cases private builders, in all whom they thought at any place would do a job at an agreed price. They have not got a staff of carpenters and bricklayers of their own. As I understand it,

they enter into a contract at different places where they have builders and contractors and people who cando the work, and that would continue under this, as far as I know.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, under project number eight, this last Spring, put out by Central Mortgage and Loan in regard to houses for municipalities, they designed the houses, Central Mortgage and Loan, and then called for tenders from various contractors. The lastproject they built at Niagara Falls was a four-roomed house with basement which would sell at $6350, or a 5-roomed house with basement which sold at $6850. The smaller house, the four-roomed one, rented for $34.50 and the larger house at $37.50.

Our agreement withthe Central Mortage and Loan was that we would put in the minor services, that is fromthe sidewalk to the house, and on a completion certificate from the city engineer that those services had now entered the house, the Central Mortgage and Loan wouldreimburse the municipality. However, the services along the street, the sidewalk, grading and the pavement and such, we paid for those but we were allowed on the last project ---it was not the same in the sixth and seventh project, but on number eight project we could borrow the money from Central Mortgage and Loan over a period of ten years for two per cent.

In regard to the purchasing of the housing, the municpality does not enter into it at all, we could advise Central Mortgage and Loan but it is their final say who should purchase the house, but if that house is rented at the present time and the present man renting it does not want to buy the house, he is forced to get out because somebody else wants to buy the house.

Those houses are rented only to veterans unless there ar not enough veterans around to rent or buy the houses, and then they go to civilians. At the present time, only a veteran in Niagara Falls can buy th t type of house and they have to pay

down, Mr. Minister, 10 per cent. of the purchase price of the house at the present time.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I think that this plan, this Bill, section one of which represents the whole Bill, is not going to solve the problem of housing in Toronto and Yorks, and I will tell you why: For two and a half years, the Toronto and York Planning Board has sought to get an agreement between some of the surrounding municipalities with land---we have not got land, we have sought to get an agreement with some of the surrounding municipalities who had land, so that some such project as this might be built. However, every time we ran up against the problem, we had the money, we were prepared to go ahead with the housing, the municipality had plans, we were prepared to provide some of the services and to pay taxes on the houses,

(Take D follows)

but the municipalities had not the finances to build the schools, and they appealed to the hon. minister (Mr. Porter) on several occasions, to assist them with the building of schools, and had that problem been solved, I think we would have had several large housing developments under way at the present time, in North York, East York, and Scarboro. However, at that time the government was not prepared to give any money towards schools, and it seems to me, under this legislation, it is doubtful if they are yet prepared to solve that problem. Indeed, those so-called "joint agreements" seem to me to refer to the joint agreements between themselves and the national housing administration, --

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) said this government had not agreed to do anything about payment for schools in the Yorks. We have agreed at all times to pay not less than fifty per cent toward these schools in connection with these housing projects out there. The hon. member (Mr. Dennison) knows that. I do know what he means by saying we never give anything towards the schools.

MR. DENNISON: You may have said that, but fifty per cent was not enough to warrant them going ahead with the project.

MR. PORTER: Oh, that is a different thing entirely.

MR. DENNISON: Well, they did not get sufficient help from the government; put it that way.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): How much help do you want? One hundred and ten per cent?

MR. DENNISON: You are paying ninety percent of the school costs in some areas, to get the necessary housing

projects under way. You could have paid ninety percent here.

HON. GEO H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): That was in case of need.

MR. DENNISON: The next thing is the problem of roadways. As the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) said the other day, these projects have to have roads, and here again the Toronto - York Planning Board has been trying for two and one-half years to get an agreement as to where the roadways will go, and we are still "stymied".

Now, the Bill before us still does not put the government in charge of any house-building; it still does not implement its promise of 1943 that you were going to establish the leadership in this thing, that you were going to set up a housing board, something like the Hydro-Electric system in the province, which would aggressively go ahead and build houses.

It is true that when we reach amalgamation, perhaps this legislation will apply. Perhaps this legislation will enable houses to be built in the Toronto and York districts, when we reach the stage of amalgamation, but until we reach that stage, I do not think this legislation will build any houses in the Toronto and York districts, and unless the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) is now prepared to give a little more toward the schools, I do not think we can solve the problem. Two of the municipalities are ready to go ahead tomorrow if that problem can be solved, if the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) is prepared to solve that problem, now, we can get under way.

There are some questions in connection with housing that this Bill does not touch.

I was talking to a builder the other day, who had built several blocks there. He is one of the best builders in the area, I think. He does not try to build expensive houses, but as he puts it, he builds the Fords, not Cadillacs. He tries to build houses to conform with the specifications at the lowest price. To give you an idea of his prices, he told me one time when we gave the contracts in Regent Park, that he could have built those houses for twenty per cent less than was being paid at that time. I think he is able to give a good price. But he tells me that under the building by-laws of North York, he cannot build a bungalow, with a solid brick wall, for less than $8,550. The by-laws at the present time in North York are forcing builders to build more expensive houses than are necessary. Apparently, because North York is so short of funds, they have to get the maximum assessment on every property. But this same builder can go over into Scarboro and can build the same buildings and sell them in Scarboro for $7,800, in other words, for $750. less. He says --

MR. DUNBAR: When amalgamation comes in --

MR. DENNISON: The city of Toronto favours amalgamation.

MR. PORTER: And do you?

MR. DENNISON: Yes, I do favour amalgamation. When this was before the city of Toronto, it passed almost unanimously. There were a couple of reactionaries on your side of the House, and a couple of the L.P.P'S, but, Mr. Chairman, this builder tells me that the great obstacle he has to face in the building of low-cost houses is the lack of uniform building by-laws. He says when he starts to build a house, he has to figure which municipality the land is located in. Each

municipality has different regulations and different by-laws, and that constantly increases the cost of his houses --

MR. PORTER: Is that a private builder?

MR. DENNISON: Yes.

MR. PORTER: I thought the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) had no confidence in the private builders?

MR. DENNISON: That is not true, Mr. Chairman. There is a great field for private builders. We are not extremists, either on one side or the other. There are some extremists who say this must all be done by private builders; others say it should be all done by the State. We take the middle-of-the-road course, in our economy here.

MR. Chairman, this builder told me that although the national housing authority permitted them to put a certain kind of roof on a bungalow, the township of North York says he cannot do that. He also tells me that although the national building authority says that he can build a dry wall construction house, if a man wants his walls finished in pine or plywood, or some of these fancy finishes, the regulations or by-laws of North York say, "No, you have to have wet walls in the construction -- wetplaster".

He says the next problem he has to face is the fact that speculators have secured the land close to the city, and are holding it for exorbitant prices. I suppose you know that situation as well as I do. Here is where section one might give you the authority to assemble some of that land in close to the city, and make it readily available --

MR. PORTER: Do you recommend it be made available to private builders?

MR. DENNISON: To anybody who will build low-cost houses. It is houses we want first and foremost. We are not dogmatic about that --

MR. PORTER: I am glad to hear that clarified. It always seemed to me to be the other way around.

MR. DENNISON: I am glad you are having it clarified, but I hope I do not have to come back here next and clarify it some more.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid a little more clarification is needed. I was interested -- and I am serious in this -- in what the government, through the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) had to say about section 5(a) of section 1. The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) gave his interpretation, and he understood those words to mean, "The acquisition and assembly of land is to be in connection with the construction of houses for sale or rent," which is subsequently referred to in the same section.

However, that was not the understanding of the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) when he moved second reading of the Bill the other day, because I think at that time he made a considered and prepared statement in which he explained the different sections of the projects involved. I want the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) to listen to what his hon. colleague (Mr. Griesinger) said on the 27th of February:

"The following types of projects are anticipated:

(a) Land assembly. The assembly of land and the installation of services after which the land would be made available to home owners and

private builders at a price to cover the cost involved.

Individual owners and builders erecting houses on such lands would either find them under conventional"

-- Pelmo Park --

"or National Housing Act loans".

That is the explanation given the other day by the hon. minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger).

Then it goes on:

"(b) Building of houses for sale. Both partners are of the opinion as I have indicated, that they should avoid getting into competition with private builders. If additional low-cost houses for sale are required, then a Federal-provincial-municipal project will be considered.

(c) Houses for rent. The desire of the partners is to encourage home ownership. If sufficient low-cost houses are erected, and sold, it immediately makes present accommodation available for others, and tends to reduce rentals."

I think that is about all I need read of that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) said on February 27th, makes it perfectly clear. What he did say, in effect, was that these classes of projects are, (a) land assembly, (b) building of houses for sale, and (c) houses for rent.

In regard to the first, the acquisition of land and assembly of land will make it available for people building for themselves, and that they will do the big job, either financing through the National Housing Act, or by the conventional

method.

If they do not do enough of a job, then they say, "We will go and consider a joint project for the construction of houses for Sale", and if that again is not sufficient, they say, "We will go a step farther and enter into joint projects for the construction of houses for rent".

This makes it quite apparent we have not got an answer to the question which was originally raised here, and I am bound to state it again, and that is, under section (e) where, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) said,"the assembly of land and the installation of services after which the land would be made available to home owners and private builders at a price to cover the cost involved".

When that happens, Mr. Chairman, what safeguards are proposed to protect the private purchasers against the failure of the private builders? I think the point can be re-inforced still further. I can re-inforce that point by what was said in this matter, by the hon. Minister of -- what do they call him now? Not the Minister of Reconstruction --

MR. PORTER: He never was.

MR. JOLLIFFE: At the time he was Minister of Reconstruction and Supply. I refer to the hon. Mr. Winters and I am sure the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) must be familiar with this.

At page 1772 of the Ottawa Hansard, we find the following:

"In certain areas of the country there are builders and other individuals who are anxious to build houses but who cannot do so because serviced land is not available.

The municipalities are pressed in financing other services within their boundaries, and do not feel that at this time they can undertake the capital financing of servicing new areas of land. Therefore authority is being sought to enable the dominion and the provinces to take ownership of tracts of land in fringe areas, and with the co-operation of the municipality, see to the installation of services. The land will be purchased jointly by the dominion and the province. Services, when installed, will be paid for by the dominion and the province. Builders and other individuals will be able to purchase these lots."

The point is, that after the Dominion and the province have bought and paid for the land, after the Dominion and the province have bought and paid for the installation and services, and after the land has been conveyed to a private builder with a building scheme, what protection does the home owner get against the failure of the builder? That is the question which has not been answered, and one to which we want an answer.

MR. GRIESINGER: Mr. Chairman, the down payment on the builders' houses could be paid to the partnership, and it could be held in trust until the house has been completed. That could be done under the agreement.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There are many things which could be done, and which would be a good thing, would will they be done, and what will be done to protect the taxpayers? After all, the taxpayers have an interest in this matter, too. They will finance these preliminaries, and then the home owners will finance more preliminaries by making a down payment, and it could

be possible, through no fault of the builder, or possibly through inefficiency, possibly through the general belief that the government has given supervision and inspection -- but in any event, the builder may fail.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister); Mr. Chairman, after all, this gets down to a question of good administration and business judgment. I would have the strongest objection to taking large areas of land in York County, or elsewhere, clearing them off, and having services installed, and roads built, sidewalks built, and all that sort of thing, and then giving them to some fly-by-night builder, who might use it for the purpose of speculation, or anything else. My feeling --

MR. JOLLIFFE: It might be just a plain incompetency.

MR. FROST: I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that it might be incompetency. I think such a thing would be unthinkable. I do not see how you can secure really a safeguard from speculation, in any other way than to permit the builders to use that land for building for the corporation. That is the way we will protect the people best.

As regards the other feature of it; I should think that any builder who uses land which belongs to the corporation -- that is, to the partnership, the municipality, the province and the Federal government -- should be bonded to assure they are able to carry out their contracts, and their should be ample protection, and I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that, after all, we are partners in this deal, and we are not going to enter into an agreement with fly-by-night people, who will leave us, or anybody else, "Holding the bag". If it is our land, and we assemble the land, for the purpose of building, then we have to accept the responsibility of seeing that the work is carried out the way we

want it to be, that is, for low-cost housing, at low prices, and under arrangements that ordinary people who can buy these houses can really carry, that is, can carry out their contracts and arrangements.

I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and some of the hon. members opposite, have been fearful that we were going ahead and acquiring large areas of land, and putting in all of the services, and doing all these things, and then selling it at cost to somebody to go ahead, with all sorts of fly-by-night schemes. If bad judgment is used, these things can happen, but I think with the great experience behind the housing corporation, that is, of Mr. Manser and his men, and we, with our men, we will stand on guard for things like this, and I think you can feel satisfied that errors of that sort will not creep into this things. We will take every precaution to see that deals are made which will provide the best and most attractive low-cost houses, and with small down payments.

To be frank, Mr. Chairman, I have had some feeling about keeping the down payment as small as possible. I would rather see people go in and acquire this property on a rental basis, to enable them to feel it was their home they were paying for, than to have a down payment, perhaps on the large side. I would prefer to have virtually no down payments, than any other sort of thing.

I would almost be tempted to go farther than that -- and I do not know whether my colleagues will agree with me or not -- that I would have no down payment at all, and that people pay for their houses on a rental basis. I would prefer that myself. I think every encouragement should be given to these

people to own their own homes, and if it was a case of losing money, I would rather lose money on that, myself, as far as the province is concerned.

I think the whole thing resolves itself down to a question of administration in the end. We are availing ourselves of the services of people with vast experience. Mr. Manser and his men and women are people who have had great experience in all the ups and downs of this business, and we are not entering into this with the idea that we are going to experiment at all. It is true that much of this has to be worked out by trial and error, but when you get down to the actual building, you have years of experience behind these plans. I think the hon. members of this House can feel assured that everything will be done to ensure that not only the purchasers will be given a square deal, but our taxpayers as well will be given a square deal. After all, we are not going into this thing except to sell these houses at the lowest possible price we can give a good house for.

MR. REID SCOTT (Beaches): We still have not an answer, Mr. Chairman. The only thing so far came from the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) when he said that down payments should be held in trust. I think that is what he said.

MR. FROST: Could be.

MR. GRIESINGER: That could be done.

MR. SCOTT: I wish you people would get together. Here (indicating) is a statement by Mr. Angus McClaskey, Ontario regional supervisor of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. He said:

"It would be impractical for the Crown Corporation to hold money in trust for would-be home owners. He said the corporation tried to do this in conjunction with its integrated housing program for veterans. Under this plan, money from purchasers is held in trust. Builders are required to give the corporation a waiver on all liens."

Mr. McClaskey said that this was started last spring, but is not practical, and has not been a success. Only five hundred houses now are being built under it.

He says:

"If we were to follow the same procedure for all homes, it would mean such a policing job that builders would stop applying for National Housing Act loans."

That is the only suggestion we have had from the government side of the House as to the method of protecting the purchasers, as mentioned, being under section "a" by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). This I have just read was stated by the regional director of housing, but we still have no answer as to what this government is prepared to do to protect these people.

I hate to be repeating this, but in regard to the Pelmo Park project, there were fifty-three people who lost $93,000, -- all of their life savings. And here you are setting up another agreement, and we cannot get an answer --

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I think I made that plain. Personally, I must admit that I do not like the idea of land that we assemble being used by private builders for private sales. After all, this is a partnership, and I do not know what the Federal housing authority might have to say about that, but personally, I do not like the idea. I made myself

plain on that, I thought. I would prefer it be built by the authority, or by the corporation, and that the sales should be made by the corporation on such terms as we lay down. That, of course, would obviate the difficulty altogether, subject to this: that if any building is done -- and certainly I am not very enthusiastic about going into a large building scheme -- by fly-by-night builders, who have not the resources to go ahead and complete their contract, I think that builder might very properly be bonded. However, that is all a matter of administration which can be carried out by the housing authority or by the housing corporation.

We are not going to sit down with our senior partner, the Federal administration, and go into a lot of funny schemes which are fly-by-night things. We have no idea of doing that. Our idea is to sit down with our partner, with all their experience behind them, and see that houses are built for the people, and then have the housing corporation itself re-sell the houses to people at the lowest possible price.

As regards taking our land, and having it farmed out to people who merely want to indulge in some sort of private or speculative building; I do not enthuse over that. If private arrangements are made, then I think it is definitely up to the partners -- to the housing corporation, and the province, the municipalities and the Federal authorities to make sure that the people who are engaged in that kind of work are bonded, and that there is full protection for the persons who deal with them.

If we are dealing with the fly-by-night builders, we had better not deal with them at all. We had better deal with our own people.

I think in matters of that sort -- quite frankly -- the authorities, if they are dealing with other people, should give some assurance over and beyond the mere fact that they are dealing, that they are standing behind the particular builder who is dealing with our land. After all, this is a different proposition than Pelmo Park, where there were advances from a mortgage company, and the sales were by a private individual. Let us remember that this proposal is one which involves our land, and our assembly, and I think it should carry with it the guarantee of the administration.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am very pleased to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) say that, and I think I can understand his feeling, that it would be one of preference that land assembled and paid for by the Dominion and the province should be built up by a public authority rather than by speculative builders.

What has been disturbing some of us is the rather excessive confidence in private builders which was expressed in the way this scheme was explained the other day. My friend, the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) said, for example, -- and I realize he was repeating pretty much what had been said in regard to the same situation by the hon. Mr. Winters --

> "Both governments are of the opinion that any action by the partners should be primarily for the promotion of the maximum amount of housing by private individuals and builders. While the legislation is, as you will see, much wider in scope, the partners are of the opinion that it would only be in the event that such

action did not result in an adequate level of housing construction, that more direct action should be considered."

He then went on to clause "a","land assembly", Clause "b" "building of houses for sale" and to clause "c"houses for rent".

This is not a question of prejudice against private builders. It is a question of being realistic. As a matter of fact, some builders in this province have done marvellous jobs in recent years; some of them have done terrible jobs. I am not letting out any secrets when I say that some private builders have been making large profits; others have not been able to keep their heads above water. We might as well be realistic about this situation. We believe in saving the lion's share to be carried by private builders, now that the so-called "boom" is over, but I think perhaps the government is expecting too much. It is more wishful thinking than anything else with them. We believe that the lion's share ought to be carried by public authority. We also feel they can achieve some economies by building in a large and more systematic way, than can some of the smaller builders. That is the point. If you put a little less faith in belief number one, and a little more faith in belief numbers two and three, we would not be so uneasy about this thing.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, as far as private builders are concerned, I think perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is laying a little bit more emphasis on that point than is perhaps justified. We must remember that last year -- in 1949 -- in Ontario we had about 37,000 units erected, and a great majority of those units were erected by private

builders, and we must not underestimate the ability of the private builders to go ahead and do a very tremendous job indeed.

I think that the emphasis laid upon it by hon. Mr. Winters, is part of the emphasis which we lay upon it.

We are anxious to get housing units erected in this province, and we recognize that private builders have really done a very tremendous job.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In some fields.

MR. FROST: Well, yes. But, remember, that in the low-cost housing field our difficulty has really been the situation that is here in Toronto. The hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) was quite bold in his statement. I must say that I agree in a very large measure with what the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) said. He said that no matter how good this Act was, he really did not think it would work in this area. I think those were his words. I am bound to say that I agree, in the main, with what he has said. I ventured to say the other day -- although perhaps I did not say it in the diplomatic way the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) did -- and some people said I had stated that they "should come together or else" --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, and "you are from Lindsay".

MR. FROST: Yes, and somebody else said I was a "backwoods lawyer" -- not in this Chamber, but outside. And somebody else said "I was a dictator", but I do not think I could sue them for libel for saying that. Someone else in this Chamber said that "in my own smooth way I would have cracked the whip". I do not know how you can "crack the whip" in a smooth way --

MR. GAISBERG: You can do it.

MR. FROST: In this area there is an antiquated

municipal system which is doing just what the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) said. It is preventing the building of houses, and I think standing in th way of the life of the people in this community. What I am interested in, and whay my hon. friend, the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) is interested in, is seeing that the people of this community get the very best "break" possible. When you get down to the question of building roads and schools, and the very much larger question of building houses for people to live in, and getting them out of the garrets and attics and bad living conditions here in the older part of the Toronto section, I would say that all of these things would fade away before an enlightened approach to the municipal problem in this area. I agree with what the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) said, and I will add this, that this problem, if we could approach it from your standpoint, by paying all the costs of education and all of the other costs -- which we cannot do in fairness to the other parts of the province -- it would not solve the situation. This has to be solved by common effort, by the people of this community who are not only prepared but determined to give this community the very best municipal service in all of Canada. When you get that, all of these problems will disappear like nothing at all.

In my opinion there is no reason why the Toronto area should not have the very best housing in Canada. They have the greatest assessment here; they have a fine location; they have other possibilities, and all of them should be working together in order to provide these things.

My hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) said he was for having a certain type of thing done. I will be more careful, and say I think there are solutions which are very obvious, and which are

waiting for the people of this area to take hold of. And when that is done, then out of the heat and fire of this present situation will come a Toronto area which will create an area in this province and Dominion second to none in the whole world. I think that can be done, and I am satisfied we will come to a solution of the housing problem in this area.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, this section deals with two separate things. We have been dealing with the 5(a) section. I would like to direct a few remarks to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) if I may, in regard to section 8(a). This is all part of the same section of the Bill.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is all under section 1.

MR. WISMER: Presumably, the housing corporation is to be permitted to loan money on real estate, in other words, to get into the real estate loaning business, and for that purpose may issue bonds, debentures, debenture stock, and so forth. But, be that as it may, I notice a new idea -- new, at least, to me -- in the second part of that section.

A few days ago we passed the Municipal Improvement Corporation Bill and provided for the issuance of debentures by a corporation, guaranteed by the treasury of the province of Ontario. We are doing all that here, but we are doing one thing in addition, that is, we are providing that notes, bonds, debentures, or debenture stock issued by the Housing Corporation Limited may be purchased by the treasurer of Ontario. I think that is rather an interesting development.

In other words, what appears to me to be a condition -- and I would like the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to clarify this -- where on one hand the borrowing is from the

public on bonds, notes, debentures, and so forth, which may be guaranteed or not guaranteed, or it may not go to the public directly, but may go to the treasurer of Ontario, and he in turn will go to the public and borrow the same money. Of course, it depends on what the mortgage conditions are, and we have heard the word "flexibility" quite often before. What I am concerned about is this: if I am right, that is what is contemplated in one of these ways in which to obtain money from the public. It would appear to me that this flexibility is there for the purpose of obtaining the money as cheaply as possible. If that is the case, I would remind the hon. members of the House that the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) suggested that the rate at which the corporation would invest in real estate-- in other words, the rate at which the cost of these houses would be written off -- was at four and one-half per cent. Now, that strikes me as being rather a high figure. If, it seems to me, we provide the housing corporation with all this amount of flexibility, in its financing, in other words, to suggest at this time that a much lower interest rate than four and one-half per cent might be contemplated in the loans of the corporation, and considering the continuous financial operations of the province -- Mr. Chairman, I want to make this very clear -- on the one hand we may be able to borrow money for twenty years at three per cent, or we may be able to borrow money for five years at one-half of that amount, but because of our continuous financial operations, which must go on every year throughout the year, it is reasonable to suspect that short-term financing by the housing corporation would provide for considerable longer term financing of real estate by the housing

corporation itself, such as is provided for in this section of the Bill.

Therefore, I would like to reiterate the great need, and say it this way; the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) suggested there should be no down payment for this type of houses. I agree. I see no particular value in a down payment. People want the house, and want to enjoy the ownership of the house as much as anybody, and if, through the use of public money, we can provide a man and his family the facilities so they can purchase a house without a down payment, and pay for it over the years, in my opinion, that is a step in the right direction. I agree with that.

But I think we must recognize this; if it is a six thousand-dollar house, and there is no down payment, you must pay interest on $6,000. until it is paid off, and the higher the interest rate, the higher the deal must be. And this becomes more important as you reduce the amount of the down payment, and a low rate of interest becomes necessary on the rest of the mortgage which must be carried. So, if the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) will be able to conform with great amount of flexibility as provided in this section, then I hope he can tell us if it will be possible to cut the interest rate as an objective to these projects, to cut the interst rate on such housing whether it may be for purchase and sale or for rental, and get them down in the neighbourhood of two per cent.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, we are, of course, most ansioux that the houses should be sold on the most attractive terms for the people. In regard to what the interest rate might work out to be; may I say again we are a twenty-five

per cent partner in the deal. The Federal administration is anxious, and we are anxious, this should be on the basis of the most attractive terms possible. What the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) says, of course, about the interim financing is, in a measure, true. It is quite conceivable that over short periods of time we would be perhaps getting money at a lower rate of interest, than on the long-term business when they are converted into mortgages. On the other hand, we must remember this -- and I think we must recognize it -- that the housing authorities have never made money.

(Take E follows)

On the other hand, remember this and I think we must recognize this, that the housing authorities have never made money. Even when you go back to the days of Mr. Drury, who was in this Chamber on the opening day, even at that time the housing authorities created in Ontario met a particular difficulty and that was some thirty years ago, and they found a losing proposition for the authorities. No doubt, we will meet with our checks and balances. I can see places where we are going to sustain losses but I see no place where we are going to make money at the present time. However, if there are little gains due to prudent financing, these things all help to take the load off the taxpayer in the end, and at the same time they do the purchaser no harm; in fact, they do the purchaser good because no doubt the rates are better than the existing rates. If it were a question of private financing, private financing could never meet the deals that will be made under these arrangements and I think in the end these things will check themselves out and will be fair.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, after the explanations given previously, I would like to seek explanation of another point, and I hope this time it will not be as clear as mud, which I think is the case in the replies given to the question on section 1, or subsection 1 of section 1. I am dealing with subsection 5 of section 1 and that is the one that provides for the remuneration of the municipalities for the loss of taxes as a result of this project. I raised the question when the Bill was up on second reading and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) replied that they would receive full taxes for the properties so constructed under this scheme. However, this subsection speaks very clearly and it speaks of some special remuneration for the loss of taxes. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that these clauses like the one I am referring to and policies which they express are responsible for the lack of housing accommodations in

this city. It is not as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) stated before that because Toronto fails to amalgamate, it is not in a hurry, we have no housing projects. I am ready to state that even if amalgamation were to take place tomorrow the housing crisis would still be with us as long as this government and the government at Ottawa will continue to withhold the necessary assistance from the municipalities who are ready and who would be ready for large scale housing projects. In Toronto and in the suburban areas the difficulty hasbeen that the suburbanmunicipalities were immediately loaded with needs which they were financially unable to assume. Now, all you are trying to do by hastening amalgamation with a silk gove and brass knuckles inside is to spread the responsibility, you are not assuming your share of responsibility which is necessary. This section is very clear, I submit, that there is going to be no payment of full taxes for the houses that will be constructed under the scheme.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I think I can clear the hon. member's (Mr. Salsberg) mind on that. If you go to any municipality in Ontario, take for instance, the city of Peterboro, in the early days the housing corporation made arrangements up there to build houses, perhaps 100 or perhaps 500 houses. In the early stages of this agreement my recollection is that there was no arrangement for taxes at all. In other words, they were Crown property and they were exempt from taxes altogether. Well, the result was this, that these municipalities were faced with a tremendous load inconnection with these houses. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunlar) many years ago made the initial arrangementswith housing corporation that they would pay an amount in lieu of taxes and figures like $70 and $75 were paid. The result was that municipalities, while they were better off, they were getting $75 in place of the $125 they should have had, nevertheless, they were getting $75 they did not get

before and that was more satisfactory. We found this situation in the Township of North York. Mr. Mitchell was the Reeve there last year and Mr. Mitchell came down here and explained to us atthat time I think the subvention was $75 but it was away below their normal costs on property of that value. It was agreed on this new agreement that the Federal authorities, whatever subvention was paid, would be a subvention which would cover the full municipal taxes in thatparticular area or in that particular municipality. The fact that it refers in the side note to payments for lost taxes just means that the taxes are lost for the reasonthat this is a Federal project and therefore is not taxable, but the Federal administration agrees with us that as part of the roject undertaken there will be a subvention paid to the municipalities which will be equal to the full amount of taxes in that community for a house of that sort. Supposing the house costs, as stated, $5800, and in that municipality a $5800 house is assessed for $4000. You will understand that may happen ina municipality and the amount of taxes is at the normal tax rate would be paid on $4000 and the municipality would get that amount. Now, in the city of Toronto if there is housing---I do not see how there could be any housing erected in the city proper because there is no land---supposing it was possible to build some place in Toronto. In Toronto, the assessment is probably 100%. which would be the normal tax rate on $5800, or it may be that if you went to the city of Chatham then $4000---$4500 or $3500 depending on what the assessment is inthat community. Our policy is to share withthe municipalitythe tax which they would receive which isthe same as if it was a private house. In other words, supposing the house is built by the Authority and is owned by the Authority for a year and is sold at the end of a year to a private person. In that case, we want the taxes that the private citizen pays at the end of the second year to be the same as the

corporation gives in subvention for the first year. That is the purpose of it, to make sure that the municipality receives an amount which is equal to the tax which it would receive if the place were in private hands.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) agree to reword that section to make it abundantly clear, because as it is it does not imply that at all. Furthermore, it is a provision which would limit the rate of payment of taxes on land acquired--

MR. FROST: The land under the Assessment Act means land and any buildings on it, that is the meaning of land there, it covers everything that is on it.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, I think under the existing agreement Central Housing and Mortgage pay a subvention only when they are rented and the moment they are sold, in the instance of these Wartime houses, they then become taxable to the corporation. Am I to understand in this that immediately they are sold the corporation has a right to assess them on the same basis?

MR. FROST: That is right, and I might say that the returns to the municipalities would be the same in every case. Our idea is that the subvention that is paid during the time that the corporation owns it would be so scientifically adjusted it would be exactly the same as the tax an ordinary purchaser would pay for the property if the property was sold.

MR. THOMAS: That varies from year to year.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has given assurance there will be a guarantee of loss of downpayment of the purchaser or at least, using their office to that extent. I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) would give similar assurance that egery effort will be made to procure an

interest rate of no higher than 2% and an amortization period of as long as possible to provide a house comparable to what is needed. I do not think at present a home costing $5800 would meet the need or demands of the people, and if a home comparable to the needs of the people were constructed it is going to be of a higher type cost and if we can keep that downpayment down that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) mentioned or at least that it would only be nominal if any at all, that could only be kept down by first, a low interest rate, and second, an amortization, a long amortization period. Can we have the gurantee of the government that that will be done?

MR. FROST: I cannot see thatwe can give a guarantee or any suggestion of a gurantee but I can say that our idea is to buy and get a nice type of house. Perhaps servicesand things of that sort which might in the ordinary course be levied against these properties and taxes will not be charged for andit may be the case that lands and services may be written off in order to bring these projects down to a price where they can be reasonably erected and reasonably sold. After all, we are 25% partners and we have s t in with our senior partner on a great number of these details, but I can quite agree with thehon. member (Mr. Thornberry) and the purpose of this is to try and provide nice, low cost housing for people. That is what we are trying to do. Anything that enters into it that props up the cost, we will try to avoid. Those things we will try to avoid in the next year or two. After all, it is only trial and error.

Sectiohs 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 63 reported.

MR. FROST. Order number 26.

DESERTED WIVES AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order number 26, House in Committee on Bill number 65, "An Act to amend the Deserted Wives and

Children's Maintenance Act," Mr Porter.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) stated the other day that the services of the Provincial Police would be available in case a deserted wife or a judge found themselves unable to locate the man who deserted the family. I understand the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) said that.

MR. PORTER: No, I just referred to main object of the Act. There is provision there for the following of a fellow who got out of the jurisdiction of any one magistrate and they are held. The results of that procedure, laid down in the Acts, have been very satisfactory, so I am informed. They work very well. I said nothing about Provincial Police.

MR. DENNISON: Well, would it not be logical?

MR. PORTER: I know, but I did not say anything.

MR. DENNISON: Would it not be logical to give the deserted wives some assistance in these cases?

MR. PORTER: That may be, but I do not think we can cover that in the Act. I do not think the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) suggests that.

MR. DENNISON: Well, probably in the regulations.

MR. PORTER: It is not necessary to cover that.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) if it is not rather precarious to leave the Act in its present form, which says:

> "The Act is amended to provide for the payment of maintenance at such intervals as may be deemed proper under the circumstances of each case."

It seems to me that is going to levy very great discretionary powers and ought to be a limitation, that it should not be longer than a certain period of time. Otherwise, there may be cases where there would be a great deal of hardship because

the time might be a month or two or three months and there will be no payments made. I am fearful lest the scope of the discretion there might work considerable hardship in many cases. It seems to me there ought to be some sort of a stop block to cover that, that it will not be longer than a certain period of time, say, two weeks, that it would be necessary to make the payment in a two-week period.

MR. PORTER: Of course, the real object sought to be gained by this section was to cover the sort of case where perhaps a person was being paid monthly. He gets his monthly salary cheque or wage whatever it may be, and then under this he would have to pay weekly. Under the present Act he would have to pay weekly and at the end of the month he may not have anything left to pay the last payment. Now a magistrate may say that he has to pay the whole amount of the maintenance per month when he gets paid per month so he cannot spread it in that way. The hon.member (Mr. Millard) has mentioned the fact that under this the magistrate has some greater discretion than formerly in order to spread out these payments according to what he may think just under the circumstances. Of course, the magistrate has always had very wide discretion and this is not a change in principle at all. The magistrate may make an order but the magistrate is under no compulsion to make any order in any case, it is always discretionary and it is up to the magistrate to decide after hearing the evidence as to whether any order should be made at all or how the interests of justice or the interests of the family can be best preserved. He makes an order for payment every two weeks or every month, depending on how often the money comes in, and sometimes it is better to get the money when it is coming in, it is better for the family than to have it spread over in weekly payments. I think that is what is really intended and I do not think any great harm will be done by widening the discre-

tion. The magistrates usually find in favor of the wives and children. They do everything they can to protect the wives and children, that is a general trend in all their decisions. This is for a greater protection rather than what the hon. member (Mr. Millard) may have in mind, that the magistrate might lean the other way and rather than allowing the man to get beyond the grasp of the law, this is going to bring him more within it.

MR. MILLARD: I would ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) if he would not consider adding that it would not be more than a month. In other words, there would be a considerable latitude over a week now provided the magistrate may spread it over to a month. I think there should be a limitation that it would not be over a month.

MR. PORTER: Well, of course, there again I suppose it depends on how often the salary comes in. If it comes in every two months then the magistrate may wish to make an order to get the whole amount in one lump sum rather than say he should pay so much this month and so much the next month, whereas next month he would have nothing left. I see what the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is concerned about, but I really think any limitation of discretion in this sort of case might work hardship the wrong way. I do not think the tendency is for magistrates to sympathize with the accused in cases of this kind. I think generally they go the other way.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has had time to consider the suggestion I made the other day. I was delighted to hear his words now that any limitation might work a hardship. In section 2 if you limit the maintenance of a child to $20 a month you are

sooner or later going to give an escape for some wealthy scoundrel who has a crippled child or a sickly child. I am not worried about an average child getting along on that, but I do say an unfortunate child may not, and this limitation ought to be taken out of there.

MR. PORTER: This $20 a month was in and out before at different times, but there was always a limitation there. What I am told is that they never have occasion to consider anything more than $20 a month. After all, that maintenance only covers the food and the clothing of the child, it does not cover rent and that sort of thing. It is $20 a month under this Act and seldom if ever has it ever been questioned. I inquired of Judge Mott, at the City Hall, who has a very large number of cases, probably as many if not more than any other judge in the province and he says that he never questions the $20 maximum there, that it is adequate for any case that came before him. That has always been there and there has never been any complaint by anyone.

MR. CALDER: I will be content to leave it if I can in time furnish the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) with one case---you can work from there.

MR. PORTER: Absolutely,

MR. SALSBERG: You find the scoundrel and he will look after him.

Sections 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 65 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 28.

THE MINING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order number 28, House in Committee on Bill number 72, "An Act to amend the Mining Act," Mr. Gemmell.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, I thought the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) told us the other day that these

Bills were going to the Mining Committee before they came to the Committee of the Whole House.

MR. W. S. GEMMELL (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, we did intend to have a meeting of the Mining Committee but I did not think there is anything in this with which you should be concerned. It is all administrative details, I do not think there is anything here.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 72 reported.

(Take F follows)

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 29.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE MINING TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 29th Order, House in Committee on Bill number 75, "An Act to amend the Mining Tax Act," Mr. Gemmell.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 75 reported.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 30.

THE HIGH SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 30th Order, House in Committee on Bill number 79, "An Act to amend the High Schools Tax Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

On section 17.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (York South): On this section 17 I want the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to explain to us the question of the abolition of high school entrance examinations. It is my information that it has been a fact in a great many cases this entrance examination has beendone away with and abolished and pupils are proceeding from the elementary school to the secondary school on the recommendation of their term's work, which also includes monthly tests. I would like to find out the system

In Toronto last year there was something like 20% who tried examination and out of the 20% a great many acquired a pass and got into secondary classes.

What is going to be done regarding thisgroup? What measuring rod is ther to find out if they are going to go to the secondary schools if they do not get thrugh on their term's work and their tests.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): There is always an appeal to the inspector when the principal doesnot

promote and that will be the only appeal they will have from now on.

The reason for abolishing the entrance examination, which was not nearly as fundamental a change as some people thought at the time, is really for the purpose of making the relationship between the work in class 9 and class 10 closer than it was before. One of the difficulties that had arisen from the old system is the jump from 8 to 9, to jump to the high school stage. And many children even afterpassing the entrance examination even if they had succeeded, the principal would not let them go on, but they did get through the examinations. Often in the high schools we get into strange surroundings and have a different curriculum. It is a move from one atmosphere to another, and instead of going ahead and getting somewhere, they did not get far. They might have been better if they did not get in at that time.

The main purpose of the grouping of these four grades from 7 to 10 is to limit that wide gap that now exists and we have been making attempts to bring together the boards of the high schools and the elementary schools and the principals of these schools in an endeavor to corelate, so the move from 8 to 9 will not create a disruption as from 7 to 8. In every other grade it goes on the principal's recommendation. One of the main objectives it to avoid the abrupt break in the two different steps. It will be like one horse rather than two. That is one of the purposes in getting rid of the examination system.

(Take G follows)

They worked throughout the year, and the knowledge of the principals and teachers of what they are doing is really better in the long run, at that stage of their lives.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to again take this matter up with the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) for this very reason. I was considerably alarmed over the number of permits that are being granted the elementary schools; at least, in the days which have gone before, we have been able to have some kind of a measuring rod. If a child could say "well, I passed my entrance examination", we all had an idea about it, but with the change in the curriculum, and the change of the organizational structure in our schools to include the seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth into an intermediate group, what will happen now if you do not have some kind of examination at this point? What is the measuring rod going to be for employers and other people? What will be the feeling of, at least, a certain section of our people toward the situation where at one time they achieved a certain standard by passing through the elementary schools and getting their entrance examinations? Now we will be stopped in the middle of the intermediate group. That is what is going to happen. If we are stopped at the discretion of an inspector, there is no real test given and no examination that a child could take, even though they are a little retarded in their term of work, and it seems to me it will place a child not in a [illegible]red position as outlined by the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), and which is desired, but really where the child will feel more frustrated and less prepared to enter into

industry or business than before, and we will have no criteria by which they can have their status or standing of education judged on any point. That seems to me to be the difficulty in regard to the abolition of the entrance examinations. All of us who got through our entrance and got a certain distance in High School had something to measure our former educational achievements, but in this case, if you do away with the examinations, and put them in the middle of the intermediate section what will be the guage or standard by which we will judge the amount of education a child has received?

MR. PORTER: Of course, in the first place, the entrance certificate really has no commercial value today. Until they get their matriculation certificate, it does not give them a standing for any kind of a job. The entrance certificate does not give them anything to assist them in getting a job.

MR. MILLARD: It means they should be able to read and write.

MR. PORTER: It does not do that sometimes, as the hon. member (Mr. Millard) perhaps has found. But it has been a view of sometime of the various officials in the Department who have given a great deal of study to this matter, that the entrance examinations are becoming less and less important as a yardstick of anything at all, and that is the great thing we wanted to accomplish, to get away from the idea of the abrupt break at that stage, and to smooth the curriculum, as much as possible.

I agree we are all concerned about the number of letters of permission, and there are various improvements I think in the situation which are gradually beginning to show. The number of people in the Normal Schools this year is quite a

bit higher, I think, at least 250 more than last year, so I am told, and there are other indications that the teaching profession will be enlarged by other types of qualified teachers, who will be coming back into it.

MR. MILLARD: I take it, it will not be necessary to reduce the qualifications for formal entrance.

MR. PORTER: I do not think that will be necessary at all. It will be the last resort.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I was going to approach this from a different angle, from the cost of education. Once a child enters High School or Grade Nine, his cost of education is much higher than it was in the public or the separate schools.

I had some experience in High Schools myself, and if you have repeaters in Grade Nine, who stay two years, you are doubling your cost of education, and these pupiles might have been better off if they had been left in public schools. Your approach now is that you are going to try to get the principals together to see which child will be promoted to the High School.

MR. PORTER: No. I think the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) misunderstands that. I said the two principals would come together and try to work out a course of study in the upper grades. I do not think the principal of the high school himself would know anything about the pupils.

MR. TAYLOR: The principal of a public school would decide who was to be promoted?

MR. PORTER: Yes, subject to the approval of the inspector.

MR. TAYLOR: I think you will find there are very few in Grade Eight who will not be promoted, especially in

the rural schools, where the school teacher is probably the aunt of all the pubils in the school.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TAYLOR: They will be promoted into the High Schools, and the cost will be doubled, because they will be repeaters. We have had that in the past.

MR. PORTER: You would like to have re-examinations retained, and keep them back?

MR. TAYLOR: That is right. You have done that in the University. You have stiffened up the examinations, so they cannot get in there; why not stiffen up the examinations here?

MR. PORTER: These things have a lot to be said for them one way or another. That may happen in some cases. Coming from a Toronto constituency, I was not aware that there were so many aunties in the country with so many nieces and nephews.

MR. TAYLOR: You visited all of the schools in my area, with a large retinue of educationalists; not with me, but with several of the higher lights of the community. I think what you are actually doing is to "pass the buck" back to the poor school teacher in the rural areas to decide whether a child shall remain in one grade, or go ahead. The teachers in my area, at least, do not like the idea of the onus being put on them, and in other words, the "buck being passed" back to the school teachers.

MR. PORTER: We can always consider re-instating the examinations.

MR. TAYLOR: That will be better.

MR. PORTER: We can call that the "Taylor Plan".

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, it is late, but I would hate to see the "Taylor Plan" introduced into education. I do not think our aim should be to prevent the children from entering High Schools, but, on the other hand, we should broaden the entrance possibilities for all pupils in the province. From that point of view, as well as from other considerations, I rather favour the general approach of the Department of Education and the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter). I think that abolition is a progressive and a welcome step. It is not always the same in each school. It is true, the teacher is in a better position to determine the ability of the pupil to proceed. I want to say to the hon. member for Temiskaming (Mr. Taylor) that I would hate to have my name associated with the proposition he has made.

MR. TAYLOR: You want the Salsberg Plan?

MR. SALSBERG: No, but I would hate to see my name associated with that proposition.

MR. TAYLOR: So would I.

MR. SALSBERG: I would sooner associate myself with the Department and the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) in this regard.

Since I have made that clear, I want to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) --

MR. PORTER: Oh, something is coming.

MR. SALSBERG: -- because I am interested in the greatest possibilities for every child to enter. That situation may arise, where a child is of an adolescent age, and may for one reason or another be slack and backward in his work for the year, but in the working-class homes, another year means an awful lot. The working-class families cannot keep a youngster in school year after year. If he gets into

High School, he does; if he does not, he goes to work. If he goes to work, he misses the opportunity for an education.

You said, Mr. hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that there would be discretion showed by the inspector. Could there be additional opportunities offered to children who are not promoted by their principal, to again have the opportunity of going on? It is only in such cases where examination had positive value, where a youngster would be shaken by the fact that he wasnot promoted, and would come to grips with the problem, and probably be a brilliant student for the rest of the high school period. I think there should be another opportunity given to him to get into the high schools, particularly because it means so much in the working class homes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, just before the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) replies to that, may I point out there is another side to the question--

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, will you allow the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to answer my side of the question?

MR. JOLLIFFE: He can answer both sides at once.

MR. PORTER: What was the question by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)? Perhaps the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) could clarify the question.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Perhaps I could. If a child be promoted beyond his capacity, it can be very damaging to that child. I know whereof I speak. I was not damaged particularly, but after passing the entrance, I went directly into the second year high school, because there was no first year high school available at the time, and it was the most miserable year of my life. I never was so unhappy. It was beyond my depth, and I did very badly. It may not have done me any damage, but I know from observation there are cases where damage is definitely done to the child who is encouraged or forced to go on before he or she is actually ready to go on.

There is also the other side about the whole picture of examinations. I am not satisfied that elimination of examinations will bring about all the good results which have been suggested it would. I heard a good example of this on Saturday morning on one of the radio broadcasts, where children were appearing from some of the best Toronto schools. I will not recount them all, but there was one where the question was asked, "In what war was Toronto occupied by American troops?" This question was put to to the children from the Toronto schools and none of them had the faintest idea what war it was. And when they were endeavored to be helped out by asking if "1812 meant anything to them," they still knew nothing about it. This may sound to be somewhat reactionary, but I think a good many of our school courses are being made too easy. I think some examination is necessary, which will show at least some of the ability of the pupils. I think a number of us would never have done what little we did at school if we hadnot had the examination.

I was recently informed by my seven year old daughter, who attends a rural school, that there would be no more grades, and no more examinations. She said, "All thatbusiness is gone." Is there any truth in that report?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: I will say in the first place I agree entirely with thehon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) whenhe says that the stulents' work is somthing that has to be watched all the time. I agree there may be many hon. members of this Legislature who could not have answered that question, or if the year "1812" had not been suggested, would have had the slightest conception of the answer to the question asked on the radio.

MR. A. A. McLEOD (Bellwoods): What about yourself?

MR. PORTER: I was not very sure myself.

MRL SALSBERG: You thought it was a symphony.

MR. PORTER: No doubt examinations some time have the effect of giving an objective and a target for the pupils to work harder in the hope of getting through. But the fact simply is this, that very few have been writing these examinations. But most them are satisfied with the principal's certificates. After all, they do write examinations in the school, set by the school. The only difference is that these departmental examinations were becoming almost extinct anyway, as set by the department, but there still are other steps, with sort of tests and reportsas to what the children do in the forms. There isno intention of abolishing the grades. You can take that home to your daughter.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I willconvey that.

MR. PORTER: As far as I know there is no intention either of abolishing the standards. That, too, may be a matter of interest.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will convey that, too.

MR. PORTER: I think itis about time you did.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): As a piece of interesting information, may I say there were several high school students visiting us today, whom I suppose had been recommended, although I didn't ask about that. One of them astonished me beyond measure by asking what the people came to this Legislative Chamber to do, and were they here all the year round. These were second or third year high school students.

MR. PORTER: That ignorance, I may say, is not confined to the pupils of any high school.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) in connection with his answers to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) why not put in the section what we find so often in the Department of Education, and say "With the approval of the Minister the child may go

on into high school"?

MR. PORTER: I am almost afraid to say, but answering that question truthfully, I am afraid there would be too many political supporters---or people who said they were --

MR. DENNISON: We seem to be discussing every part of this Bill except this section. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to this suggestion. The hon. member for East York (Miss MacPhail) several years ago suggested that Ontario should establish more high schools on the farms where there would be training in farming, and perhaps less academic study. I refer to the ones such as we have at the present time I believe at Ridgetown, Ontario. It was my pleasure last year to meet several people from thehigh school at Ridgetown, where a good deal of the day's work in good weather is spent out in the field, pruning trees, picking apples, and packing apples and learning to be good farmers. That seems to me a good idea. I was wondering if the government has done anything about it, since the matter was suggested to them by thehon. member for East York (Miss MacPhail).

At that time the then Minister of Education, the hon. Premier (Mr. Drew) seemed to favor the idea; in fact, I believe there was a suggestion in your own platform to that effect, and I wonder if anything has been done in that respect.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest in regard to this question, which is a very interesting one, that it is one which might properly be asked when the estimates come down. No doubt there will be a few questions asked by the hon. members at that time. They seem tobe very inquisitive around estimate time. We are at section 17. There are a few more short sections inthis Bill. If the hon. members feel they still have a number of questions to ask, we will let the Bill stand over. On the other hand, if you are satisfied, the Bill may go through now. It is now ten

minutes after six. We have no desire to stop any questioning, and if any hon. members feel they would like to ask further questions, we will let the Billstand over until next day.

(Take H follows)

Sections 17 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 79 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr.Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report certain Bills.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report five Bills without amendment, and moves the adoption of the report.

Report agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, I would like to have the House sit tomorrow afternoon at two o'clock, if possible. We have a large number of speakers on the Throne Debate, and the intention would be to go ahead with that Debate tomorrow afternoon.

I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that when this House adjourns, the present sitting thereof, it stands adjourned until two of the clock tomorrow afternoon, and that the provisions of Rule Two of the Assembly be suspended so far as they might apply to this motion.

Mr. Speaker, in making that motion, I may say it is for the purpose of giving our hon. private members ample opportunity to speak. We would be going ahead with Bills again on Wednesday afternoon. I mentioned to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) opposite that we would, Wednesday afternoon, have a very light afternoon -- we would take the Labour Bill, the Discrimination Bill and the Marriage Bill.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:15 o'clock p.m.

- - - - -

Volume 14.

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS SEVENTH DAY OF MARCH, A.D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT TWO O'CLOCK, P. M.

Toronto, Ontario
Tuesday, March 7, 1950
2.00 o'clock, p. m.

2.00 O'CLOCK, P.M.

And the House having met.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been suggested to me by several of the hon. members, that if the hon. members and those in the gallery would like to join in the Lord's Prayer, at the conclusion of the prayers, it is perfectly all right. It is entirely up to the discretion of the individual hon. members, and I thimk it would be very, very helpful.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the first report of the Committee on Private Bills, and move its adoption.

CLERK ASSISTANT: To the Honourable, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario.

Gentlemen:

Your Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills begs leave to present the following as its First Report:-

Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:-

Bill No. 1 - An Act respecting the town of Port Hope and Trinity College School.

Bill No. 2 - An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Bill No. 6 - An Act respecting the city of Port Arthur.

Bill No. 9 - An Act respecting the Central Canada Exhibition Association.

Bill No. 10 - An Act respecting the Border Cities Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations.

Bill No. 13 - An Act respecting Mount Hamilton Branch Canadian Legion and Salvation Army.

Your Committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actucal cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting the Border Cities Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations"; and Bill No. 13, "An Act respecting Mount Hamilton Branch Canadian Legion and Salvation Army".

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) Bryan L. Cathcart.
Chairman.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

MR. R. ROBSON (Hastings East): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, and move its adoption.

CLERK ASSISTANT: The Honourable, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario.

Gentlemen:

Your Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization begs leave to present the following as its Second Report:

Your Committee begs to report the following Bills without amendment:

Bill No. 85, "An Act to amend the Agricultural Societies Act, 1939."

Bill No. 86, "An Act to amend the Milk Control Act, 1948."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) Roscoe Robson
Chairman.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Order No. 6.

DEBATE ON THE THRONE SPEECH

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, resuming the adjourned

debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the honourable, the Lieutenant Governor, at the opening of the Session.

MR. G. W. PARRY (Kent, West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take my small part in this debate, my remarks will be confined largely to agriculture. However, before proceeding, I wish to compliment the mover (Mr. Reynolds) and the seconder (Mr. Leger) of the reply to the Throne Speech. I am sure if the late Walter B. Reynolds could have heard the address given by his namesake, he would have felt quite proud of the representation that has succeeded him in the county of Leeds.

The hon. member for Cochrane, North, (Mr. Leger) gave a fine address. I envied him somewhat, because he was giving his address in English, and I know that he could have done equally well in French, and I want to congratulate the French hon. members of this House, and to say that I think they are a great asset to its deliberations.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is not in his seat today, but I would like to make one or two comments in regard to him. I think that he has shown a spirit that should exist throughout the length and breadth of this province, and a willingness to co-operate. Those are things which governments lack at times, and I do think that his spirit of co-operation, the hand of fellowship he has extended to the other provinces and to the Federal government, and down through the cities, towns, counties, and villages throughout this province is appreciated, and I feel that I am voicing that sentiment of all the hon. members of this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARRY: I would like now to say a word or two regarding our casualty list. I would not go so far as to try and blame the opposition for this, but it does seem that all the casualties fall on this side of the House. We all miss the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) in this Legislature, and also the former Attorney General, the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell). We, as a party, miss them, and I believe the whole province suffers from the lack of their wise counsel, which was always very much appreciated.

There is one other hon. member who is not here, and I refer to the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Nault), and I know I am voicing the wish of this entire House when I say that we wish them all speedy recoveries.

I am now going to speak a few words on my own county, the county of Kent, which is recognized by all the people, who want to be honest, as the best county in the province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARRY: But I do want to say we have some peculiarities down there.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARRY: We grow all kinds of crops, and we also raise large families. Perhaps I should not say this in the House, but I have the honour to have fifteen grandchildren.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARRY: And I do say that we do not have to take a back seat for any county, as regards organizations. I believe we were one of the first counties to organize under the Farm Products Marketing Act. We have had a great deal of farm advancement in our county in southwestern Ontario. The remark has been made here, I believe by the hon. member for

Grey South (Mr. Oliver) that we are spending a great deal of money, and I agree with him. But I think as long as we are putting the money to good use, building roads, for education, and so forth, it is money wisely spent. With the progress in our county, and the increased population, there has been some justification for an increase in the amount of money we are spending, particularly on education.

I would also like to pay my respects to our good hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucott). An amendment to the Act made it possible, in my county, for us to build a new bridge across the Sydenham River at Wallaceburg. Had it not been for that change in the Act, it would have been nearly impossible to build a bridge of that type. There are seven thousand people in that community, two thousand on the north side, and about five thousand on the south side of the Sydenham River. They had a little old bridge there, which had been built for some time, and was very antiquated.

I have some figures here, with which I will not bore the House, because I understand we are checked if we start reading, and I do not want to be guilty of that offence, but just a figure or two in regard to the hard-surface roads in the province of Ontario. We have 5,608 miles of the King's highway; 2,981 miles of county roads; 523 miles of township roads, all hard surfaced, making a total of 9,202 miles.

All hon. members can understand that mileage of that magnitude requires a great deal of money, but I think it is money wisely spent, and that we are getting full value for our money, when it is spent on education and in the building of real roads.

I will now come back for a few minutes to the Farm Products Marketing Act. I do not like to single out any hon. member, but I would like to mention our genial friend who said the Marketing Act was antiquated. I think those were his words. May I say to the hon. members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that the Farm Products Marketing Act is the people's own organization. They organize amongst themselves. There is not governmental agency forcing the farmers into any marketing scheme, unless the farmers themselves desire it. A scheme is voted on, and in once case it requires 66 2/3 per cent, and in the other case, 75 per cent, in favour of organization. When organized, they select their officials and appoint their officers, and then ask the government to set up machinery whereby they can sit down and negotiate prices with, for instance the tobacco companies, or the canning companies, or the grain dealers.

In my estimation, this is one strong point pertaining to agriculture. We also have the labour organizations, and I want to compliment them for organizing. I think it is wise for them to have organizations, just as much as we should have organizations to market all our crops.

I would like to mention a few of these marketing schemes. First, let us consider the Ontario Sugar Beet Producers Association. This has been in existence for about ten years, and what organization could be more important than that? In 1943, due to the low price which had been set on sugar, the two canning factories at Chatham and Wallaceburg were faced with the possibility of having to close their factories. I presume the hon. members will remember that we asked for some assistance, which was given, and I think it was foresight on the part of the government when this assistance was given

to this great industry, because last year we did not require any assistance at all, due to the price of one dollar per one hundred -- one cent per pound -- raise in the price of sugar.

We have an organization of four thousand members, or perhaps a little larger. Out of those four thousand members they have set up machinery for defining areas. They have nine or ten different areas, which are representative. Then this group selects three to compose a negotiating committee, which negotiates prices, deliveries, and acreages, with the processing companies. The same thing applies to some of our other organizations, for instance, the Burleigh marketing scheme, which has proved so successful in western Ontario. I am now getting outside the boundaries of Kent county, but I wanted to mention the tobacco organization and the sugar beet organization, because it takes in five or six of the counties in southwestern Ontario.

I also want to mention one other marketing scheme, and that is the white bean and soy bean, which are both under a marketing agreement. I believe there are some hon. members here who will speak on marketing agreements and agriculture, so I will confine my remarks to some of those products which are very vital in the county in which I live.

I would like to say a word or two of how we regard the importance of improved seed. In connection with hybrid seed corn; advancement has been made through the assistance of the college at Guelph, and the provincial agriculture experimental farms at Ridgetown and at Harrow.

Some ten or eleven years ago, the corn borer was creating somewhat of a connundrum to us, in an effort to de-

vise some way to combat the corn borer. We developed a new variety of seed corn known as "hybrid", which is resistant to the corn borer -- in fact, we have developed three varieties, the early, medium, and late. I have only the figures here for 97 acres of corn which was grown in Lanark county, a thing unheard of fifteen years ago. This gives an estimated yield of 60 bushels to the acre. I consider this a great advancement, Mr. Speaker, and it demonstrates the importance of having a proper seed.

We are also going to carry that on with regard to the white beans. We have the early and late varieties of white beans, which are very uniform in character. We have developed another soy bean, both early and medium, and different varieties suitable for local ripening conditions.

Then we have the Cornell wheat, which is grown quite extensively throughout the whole province. The Cornell wheat is resistant to smut, and thoroughly resistant to rust.

I am adding all of these various crops together for one reason. Today we are harvesting these crops with mechanized equipment. Consider, for instance, the corn crop. The corn will stand where, if you use the picker, and labour costs enter into the pickers, and reduce the cost of labour in the harvesting. The same with white beans and soy beans, which, with their uniformity of ripening, can be harvested with mechanized equipment, and also the Cornell wheat. All of this improved mechanized equipment is of great assistance, because we are growing corn today which I believe will yield from ten to twenty bushels, and the same with beans, white beans, and other various crops. They will show an increased yield, with better quality.

I would like now to say just a word regarding marketing of the quality products we are producing. We are in a much better position with collective marketing than we were with individuals attempting to market their own products. We have men who have the ability to sit down around a table and negotiate prices with dealers, I believe that is advantageous to industry, in that we have some say in the produce we have to dispose of, because we are an exporting people. Our surpluses have to be exported.

I would say, in passing, there is one thing that we, as farmers, are similar to labour in that whatever labour is manufacturing, whether automobiles, or stoves or ploughs, or whatever it may be, shouldknow the cost of production, and it should be the same with our products, that we should know the cost of producting, and we know that we must not raise the prices so high that they will price us off the market, because we are faced with competition today, and we feel that that competition will be greatly increased as time goes on. As some of the countries of Europe get back on their feet, they will start producing again, and we will have to learn again to deal with those producing countries.

It seems to me there was a very good point brough out here in debate, that we have, in one way or another, to plan our budget so as to increase the dollar values for our markets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not very much more to say. But before taking my seat, I would like to say a word to the effect that I am vitally interested in the grand work that is being done through the assistance of the Department of Agriculture, and the district representatives, amongst the younger people of this province. We have boys' and girls'

clubs , -- young men's clubs -- where they hold debating societies, and field days, and they have gained the respect of the whole community. However, in my estimation, they are doing more than that. I would just like to mention the town of Chatham, where we have, I suppose, possibly four hundred or five hundred boys and girls who belong to juvenile organizations. Then we have three different clubs, the J.C.'s, the Kinsmen, and the Optimist Clubs, which are working together, in putting on an industrial and agricultural show at Chatham. That spirit is growing in my county, and I am sure we should all try and encourage and urge the young popple to understand one another better.

Another thing that I think is important, is that the young people are doing their own thinking. That is a grand spirit. They are trying to do things for themselves, without asking the government to help them all the time. I think some of us older people could take a leaf out of their book , with advantage to ourselves. Personally, I have no fear, regarding marketing conditions, when we have good, clean, young citizens coming up, and making efforts to do things for themselves. So I would urge every hon. member in this House to encourage the young people in the ridings to get together. That should be encouraged, both in the rural and urban constituencies, and they will make better citizens because they will understand one another better.

I am sorry the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) is not in the House, but I do want to say that he sponsored our trip to the north country, to visit what we call the "northerners". The southerners went up to visit the northerners, and I do not think we could exceed in the south

the hospitality they showed us in the north. There is one thing, however, I think we should encourage them to come down to south western Ontario, where we will also be able to tell them something about our need for roads. We need them in the south, as much as they need them up there. If they will come down and visit us, we will understand one another better, and we will, I am sure, be able to make them realize that our roads are the same as they are in the north country. It was a grand thing to have made that trip, a group comprised of all parties represented in this Legislature, and if we could only reciprocate this coming year and have them come down to south western Ontario, it would be appreciated, I am sure. We will endeavour to entertain them, although we cannot surpass what they did for us last year, but at least we can impress on their minds our need for roads in south western Ontario.

I have been thinking about the remark of the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) when he said something about "Americans coming over here and going up and down -- 'looting' --"was it not? I do respect the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) ability, in debate, but I do disagree with him on that score. I think we are very fortunate, having only 14,000,000 people, to be living so near to our neighbour to the south -- a friendly neighbour -- with about 160,000,000 people with just an imaginary boundary line between. I think it is our duty to be good neighbours. That is all they ask. They are not coming in here to try and absorb us. Let us consider the situation in which we are geographically placed and compare it with some of the poor little countries in other parts of the world. I think in that connection, we have a great deal to be thankful

for.

My good friend, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Prydd), closed his remarks by quoting that good old hymn, "Lead Kindly Light", but I will say to the hon. members opposite, that all they have to do, in my opinion, is to get on the wagon, and then we will go places. Let us get on the wagon, and we will go farther by working together.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Some might fall off the wagon.

MR. PARRY: No, we will take care of that part of it. However, there will be no "Tories" fall off, because they all ride pretty well.

May I say to my hon. friends opposite, "Do not be so gloomy".

May I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying:

"Let your light so shine before men that they may see the good works that ye have done."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Acting Speaker, I would like, first of all, to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member for Kent West (Mr. Parry) in thanking the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) for the splendid trip we enjoyed to northern Ontario last September. It was an education. It was more than an education; it was an opportunity for us to get to know all hon. members representing other sections of the House, as well as our own, and I am sure they hon. members representing ridings in southern Ontario realize better the potentialities of that grand northland.

For ten days we travelled by plane, by bus, by train, even by freight car, and by automobile, through a section of

Ontario which, in its own right, would be an empire if it was in certain sections of the world. We saw steel mills, pulp mills, paper mills, lumber mills, mining industry, and agriculture, which were exhibited to us. We were welcomed at every stop by members of the boards of trade, the chambers of commerce, by business men, by merchants, and in one or two instances I was pleased to see we were welcomed by organized labour. When we reached the great iron mine at Steep Rock, we were welcomed, for the first time on the trip by a representative of the steel workers union, and I had the privilege of accompanying two of them on a fishing trip that evening.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Did you catch any fish?

MR. DENNISON: Although we saw great examples of the wealth of Ontario, we also saw sad examples of the districts in new Ontario. On the trip to the dam, north of Atikokan, we passed through sections of woods there where the pulp companies had stripped out the spruce trees, and left the red pines standing, and left the jack pine and the poplar stand, and the wind had proceeded to blow those trees down into a tangle of roots and branches. I am sure every hon. member must have felt the futility of the wood operations, as was so well pointed out in the Kennedy Report on Forestry. I am sure we had an example when we reached Fort Williams, where we saw one of the best equipped and most efficient saw mills in this province lying practically idle for want of saw logs, and within a mile of it, a pulp company which should not have been in the saw mill business at all, had set up an excuse for a saw mill, a little mill which would have made the settlers blush with shame, such a mill which I do not believe would be able to saw a one-inch board without having one end of it

half an inch thicker than the other, and yet I understand that excused them from having to turn over the saw logs to the lumber mill in that area.

It seems to me that the future of new Ontario lies in careful government management of our resources. We should husband those resources, and except in a few areas, I believe the future of new Ontario lies in its mining wealth, its possibility of smelting the products of the mines into steel, and into finished products, and shipping those finished products to the markets of this continent.

I do not think this country should continue to be the hewer of wood and the hauler of water for financial interests, the majority of which live outside of our boundaries.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: I believe that the wealth of Ontario should be developed for the benefit of Ontario, and those processes in the north should be finished processes, not just fitting processes to the mills of the United States of America.

I think it was very clear to us as we travelled through the north country. I was sorry, too, that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) was not with us, because if we heard one song from one end of the north land to the other, we heard the cry for "roads, roads, and more roads". That 175-mile strip of unfinished No. 17 highway between Terrace Bay and the head of the river, has caused a steady lament that it is not yet finished. I, personally, cannot see why Ontario, with its resources, should not go ahead with the completion of that highway, regardless of whether, at the moment, we have the authority or agreement from Ottawa, because

when a decision is reached to build the Trans Canada Highway, we will undoubtedly get credit for that portion of it which we have already built.

I want to say that one of the interesting things was that we enjoyed the fellowship that we had with the Cabinet Ministers on this trip, and I could not help but remark, however, on the number of "free enterprise" speeches which were made on the trip. We all got a turn at speeches. They did not monopolize all the time, but they monopolized the time which was spent on pressing free speech, and, incidentally, warning against any enterprise on the part of the public or this government. The hon. member for East York (Miss Macphail) finally said, in Kirkland Lake, I believe it was, after the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) had made a very eulogistic free enterprise speech, "I think these commercials should stop, and not talk so much about 'free enterprise', but let us have a little more about ' government enterprise' -- and a little less about "free enterprise' ".

MR. W.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Do you not remember when the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) proposed subsidized industry for northern Ontario?

MR. DENNISON: I am afraid I was not present at that time, because I can hardly credit the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) making a speech of that kind.

On one occasion, I believe while we were at Terrace Bay, and one or two hon. Ministers had made their speeches on

"free enterprise", it occurred to me, "where was the free enterrise?" We were standing on government land, controlled and owned by the government; the company which was banqueting us was operated by the government, the government controlled the timber limits in which we were, and the hydro system was supplied by the publicly-owned hydro. Even the hotel we were in at the time of the banquet was a company hotel, and honest to goodness, I do not think free enterprise was within one hundred miles of the place about which the hon. Minister was making a speech.

It seems to me we have to be careful in new Ontario and not mistake monopoly enterprise for free enterpise. Free enterprise is enterprise of the small business man, the man who has the chance in the industry to go to the top, but, after all, when you think of the whole of new Ontario given to the pulp companies, what chance has the little pulp man to start up, and get a start in that country? The field has already been given away. Even the lumber companies in the north find it hard enough to take these monopoly enterprises which have moved in from across the United States border. I see the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) is now in his place, and I am sorry he did hot hear the lavish praise I gave him. I will say, for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) that he alone, of all the Cabinet Ministers, did not make a speech on "free enterprise", and if I loved him before, I love him twice as much now for that.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) in his speech the other day, sought, I believe quite unsuccessfully, to take credit for the propperity we find ourselves in. He chose, of course, to completely ignore the growing unemployment.

He chose, I believe, to take credit for the prosperity, which is, in the main, I believe, coming to us from way beyond our borders, and which is the result of world conditions more than the result of any planning on the part of this government. He did not give credit, for instance, to the billions of dollars which have been poured into Europe by the Marshall Aid, millions of which have found their way back to the province of Ontario to purchase our food, and our manufactured goods, and to make it possible for us to avoid the expected depression, which most business men expected about two years ago. I think we have to give credit to that fact, in analyzing the reason for our present prosperity.

Now, after World War I, the conditions in Europe were entirely different than they are today. After World War I we had fifteen years of comparative peace, and this monopoly system went through two periods of "boom" and two periods of "bust". Many people expected the same thing to happen this time. But there were certain factors which prevented that happening. For one thing, after World War I there was no power in Europe of any strength to speak of; there was no danger of war for fifteen years. The situation is not the same today.

After World War I the Russia of that day was entirely different in her international attitude from the Russia of today. After World War I Russia gave back to Poland and to Finland and some of the countries which were conquered by the Czar, and under the heel of the Czar -- she gave them back their freedom. The Russia of today is leading the way in what the Russia of 1919 used to call "imperialism" and we find that Russia is not only taking, but will keep the countries she has conquered when she was the ally of Hitler,

and is seeking, I imagine, to bring about the economic absorption of those countries.

Today, consider the situation of the city of Berlin. The territory west of Berlin was liberated by the armies of Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. However, after Berlin fell, Russia was allowed, by agreement, to move into that territory, and then she sought to put road blocks up to stop the supply of food and the necessities to the people of Berlin. This has had a great effect. This has been the tragedy of this last war, the tragedy that the Allies should not have renounced Imperialism, or renounced the acquisition of territory. Had that happened, I do not believe we would have needed Marshall Aid, nor to have the situation as it exists to me. It seems to me, that fact, and that fact alone, has been the reason why the hard-headed United States senators with their Tory mentality, when handing out these billions of dollars, were getting back in return, not tangible assets, but probably the security that the whole of Europe would not be over-run by Russia.

I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has to take that into consideration when taking credit for this prosperity.

As far as I can see, our prosperity has not been the result of any intelligence, or any capacity for planning, or any experienced thought as to the future welfare of this province, on the part of the government. It is attributable to the conditions I have mentioned. The same thing is true, practically, in regard to housing. The Globe and Mail in this morning's paper, attempts to reassure the people of Ontario that the housing problem is solved. In the Globe and Mail this morning, it is suggested that the "pay like rent housing

plan wins committees' approval". As I see it, this Legislature has not given any approval to "pay like rent housing plan". It becomes quite clear that the government itself has not the faintest idea of what it intends to do with regard to the housing legislation. The government has apparently been negotiating with Ottawa since last summer, according to its own statement, and negotiations have not matured to the point where it is possible to get anything in the way of a concrete plan. Indeed, the hon. ministers in their statements to the press, have made entirely opposite pronouncements on this question of housing. The hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) for instance, in a prepared statement last week, said the main type of project planned in the new legislation was to assemble the land and make the land available to private builders.

HON. GEO H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, is it permissible to discuss a Bill in this Chamber before it has received third reading by the House?

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I am discussing a headline in the Globe and Mail, and I am discussing announcements made outside of this House by the hon. ministers.

Now, the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) has another idea. He suggests that the government should merely assemble the land, and they cannot turn it over to any builder over whom they have no control. That was about the position of the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) in the House the other day.

Now, the confusion which has developed because of this fact, and the confusion which has developed because of this headline in the Globe and Mail this morning, shows that I do not think this House has ever made any such decision, and

no. hon. minister has made such a statement in the House. The hon. minister said it could be undertaken, but neither the minister, nor the spokesmen for this government have said it will be undertaken.

(Take B follows)

It seems to me that if the government had any idea of pay as you go on the type of housing contracts, we should have more definite information when the matter is being discussed. It seems to me that we have a situation in Ontario now where the government is attempting to lead the people along a path to rule the people when no suggestion in the House has been made.

Our problem in Ontario today is that we are in the position of losing our best market in the sterling area. That problem has been brought to the attention of the Federal government.

The hon. Mr. Abbott, when it was brought up, brushed aside the suggestion we should lower tariffs, and also brushed aside the suggestion that we should take from Great Britain part payment in sterling.

The hon. Mr. Abbott will not brush aside that Great Britain bought from us $418,000,000 more than we bought from them. And in the present sterling situation, Great Britain, in the sterling area, cannot do that kind of thing.

Sooner or later we will lose our best customer, unless we find ways and means of purchasing more than we are selling to it.

Our relationship to the United States does not present a picture that is any brighter. In 1947 we had a deficit of over $900,000,000 a yearin our trade. We purchased thatmuch more than we sold. You cannot do that unless there is some sort of balance.

In 1948, because of the controls that were put in by the government, because of the purchases fromthe United States, our deficit in 1948 was $283,000,000. In 1949 it jumped up to $427,000,000.

In Ottawa when the hon. Mr. Abbott says that he isnot concerned when he rejects the idea of adjusting our tariffs, he knows whathe is doing. He will tie himself up to the Geneva

Agreement. He exhibits the same sort of attitude as did the Liberal Party in Ottawa in 1929.

The attitude of the Federal government in this connection is very deplorable.

Where is this shelf of duplicate work? Mr. Howe said on April 12th 1945:

> "The purpose will be to have on hand at all times a shelf of public projects already planned and available when needed to stimulate employment in any given area."

That is what he said in 1945.

MR. SPEAKER: While anxious to give full latitude on discussion in the debate with regard to the Speech from the Throne, I really question whether we should discuss the variable actions of the Federal government. In the addresses in reply to Speech to the Throne I wish to give every liberty that is possible, but I am not sure that we should discuss Federal affairs and Federal problems in the House. I think there are limitations which should be applied.

I do suggest, that while all liberty will be given, we have enough to do in our own House on provincial matters. Would it be possible to bring us back home.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to comply with your ruling. You have been so fair in all your rulings. I do not want to do anything which might go against them.

But I believe I am dealing with one of the most important issues facing the people of Ontario---losing our foreign trade and our market in the British area and accordingly creating unemployment in Ontario.

I might say this government is also responsible for providing public work andemployment to absorb the slack at the present time.

I think the major responsibility rests with the federal government and more so than in 1945, and that they should be ever ready to go ahead without any starter.

I would like to say something in connection with subsidies. The other day the House was discussing Steep Rock iron ore, and the fact that an American syndicate came into Ontario to develop our natural resources.

That is not the whole story. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that Canada is subsidizing the steel industry in this country to an extent greater than the profits. In 1947 the total subsidies paid to iron and steel industries amounted to $11,702,000. And the profits as announced for that year was $8,608,000. We are subsidizing these people to a greater extent than the amount of the profits.

It is not particularly true to say that the development of our Steep Rock is the result of free enterprise, but is the result of the risk that free enterprise will take. When the federal government subsidizes that kind of thing there is no record. Their profits are real. I expect that Canada will have to subsidize this steel industry for some years.

Dr. Hanman said: "There is a direct connection between tumbling farm prices and the increasing ranks of the unemployed"

I agree with that. I agree with the connection between "tumbling farm prices" and the "unemployed."

The farmers in Ontario and in Canada, during the war, were promised that they would be given all help to compete against American fruit and vegetables until their own were used. On the first of December, in Toronto, I saw

American carrots, celery, cabbage, and other vegetables for sale, and Canadian farmers still had these on their shelves.

I think something can be done for our farmers. He should have the whole Ontario market when he is able to supply that market. I notice in reviewing the fight that went on in the Federal House, the hon. members continued the milk subsidy; it was voted 69 to 41 to continue the subsidy on milk. The C.C.F. and the Government supported it, in 1946. But the subsidy was taken off.

Today in Toronto, while we are supposed to have apples, where we should pay 75 cents to 80 cents for the first-grade, you are paying from $4. to $4.50 a bushel for these apples.

Through creating legislation, this Government has the responsibility to cut down the spread between what the farmer receives for his products and what the consumer pays for it in the city.

In connection with honey, the bee market comes under that heading -- they have pretty well their own distributing system, and they are one class of agriculturists which have practically eliminated the middle man.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: I would like to say something about the old-age pensioners. Canadian old-age pensioners have been subject to more broken promises from more parties than any group of people in our history. Let us review the promises. Since 1919 I can remember promises made by political parties that they were going to get pensions for the old people. It was always to be after the next election. Let us review some of them. The Liberals in the last election

made statements that they would make payments to pensioners at 65, and do away with the means test, and increase the payment.

In one riding in Toronto the candidate went so far as to say that there would be $30 to everyone over 60 years of age and that would be without the means test.

AN hon. MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. DENNISON: "Mickey"Rooney, I believe.

In 1948 the Conservatives saidthey would eliminate the means test and that there was a proper plan established to give attention at everyone at 65. They also said that until a proper plan was made they would pay the pensioners at 65.

Now the Federal Liberals are attempting to hide between the two. They maintain they have to have an agreement with the provinces first. That is not unknown. That is anold chestnut.

On the 14th of February in Toronto, hon. Walter Harris, who is Minister of Immigration, at an audience in my own riding said: "Social security is the official postion of the Liberal Party." And he also said: "The day of rugged individualists who opposed social security is past."

And Mr. Leslie Mutch M. P. (Assistant Minister of Veterans' Affairs), used these words: "The creed of social security was based on plausible falsehoods." He attacked the C. C. F. and Conservative promises. He said: "The excuse of the lazy, the weak-willed, and the refuge of the coward."

We have been having plenty of promises but very little else. These were on the same plane.

We are subjecting the old age pensionersin this country to a shamefully handled situation and it calls for remedy.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): You are driving the otherparty out of the House.

MR. DENNISON: I wouldlike to have something done in connection with the means test and this is now before the Minister of Welfare. I trust that they will be able to do something about it.

Here is a point I would like to bring up. In Cornwall Mrs. Leroux died in April 1949. She waited until she was73 years of age before getting a pension. She was only receiving the pension for three years when she died. She received the sum of $940.

Her son, Hector, had remained at home until he was 40 years of age to look after his mother before he did get married.

Mrs. Leroux left her property to Hector. After the Federal taxes and local taxes and other taxes were deducted he had to pay out a total of $431. He exhausted his means to pay this sum. And then he receives a letter fromthe Department for $612 of the $940 which his mother received. His mother, Mrs. Leroux, when she approached the clerk in Cornwall, was told her property was assessed at $1200---which is, by the way, a 50-year old house of pine floors and wooden roof and was not in good condition. She was told her property was assessed for $1200 and she need not worry. She was told there would be no claim on her property after her pension. After she got a pension, about a month later, Mrs. McIntosh came to call upon her and she asked Mrs. McIntosh if she would have to pay this back out of her property, or 'would my son have to pay it back when I die?' She told Mrs. McIntosh that if that was the case she would not want the pension and Mrs. McIntosh told her thatshe need not worry. Mrs. McIntosh told her "you can have your pension andkeep your

home.

I am trying to draw to the attention of the House these matters. And it all goes back to the means test.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: I would like to say a word on the hospital service.

The hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Rea) spoke on this the other day and I thought he was very gloomy onthe question. I want to cheer him up. I don't think that health insurance is as bad as he thinks. I am not in favor of the insurance entirely. He made the statement that the insurance in effect in British Columbia was not workingout satisfactorily because of the shortage of hospital beds. Thatis a problem that any government has to seriously go into---the question of supplying prepaid care for the people and they have to go into the question and the problem of supplying more hospital beds.

I drew the attention of the House to what has been done in Saskatchewan where the number of beds per person has been increased since the plan came into effect from three per 1000 to over 11 per 1000.

If Ontario seriously went into the problem of added hospital service they would do the same thing.

After all we are short of hospital beds under the present system. Persons under some of the present private health schemes cannot get a bed. They have to wait for weeks. If the patient is not suffering from a serious illness they have to wait for weeks.

I would like to remind the hon. member for St. Patrick (Mr. Rea) this government a few years ago promised to give us a hospital and a medical and a surgical and insurance service. No municipality has agreed to come in under these services. I felt that was best at that time, but no municipality has agreed to come in.

The Act is lying on the statutes gathering dust and hasnot

been applied. According to this latest piece of legislation the muhicipality would have no control of it except to collect the money. For the money, it goes to the hon. Minister of Health, and he would decide who would get the service andhow much and decide what kind of service they would receive and so on. We feel that the Act just was not workable and again we suggest to the government that they bring in a stronger municipal Act.

Now, dealing with hydro. I believe our hydro system isone of the greatest enterprises in the province today.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: It is a matter of public enterprise. It is a $600,000,000 enterprise.

HON. G.H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): There is no ribbing about that.

MR. DENNISON: It is savng the people of Ontario many millions of dollars a year. It has been cited as an example across the line in the United States -- it has been stated there that people under private enterprise are paying two three times as much as we are for the hydro. On that basis the Hydro of Ontario is saving the people of Ontario a total of $130,000,000 a year. Nearly three-quarters of the taxes to the government taken from the people is looked after by this great publicly owned enterprise. Some provinces in Canada are not quite satisfied with the result we are getting. I notice that in Nova Scotia, radio station at Halifax is conducting on behalf of the Nova Scotia Light and Power Co. a program trying to scare the people from publicly owned hydro. They have a weekly program on that station speaking of the troubles of publicly owned hydro. What a horrible program that must be. Since the end of war we have brought into production in the hydro more than 450,000 horsepower. We could have sold more if we had it. In 1945 and 1946 when we could have got nowhere with new developments we brought in 77,000 horsepower. In 1948 we brought

in 163,000. In 1949 we had no new production brought in but we got the rain at the right time.

In 1950 we are in the position of having a considerable quantity of power brought in. In the Des Joachims 240,000 horsepower. At the Tunnel Station 56,500. At Pine Portage 80,000. And with the package units 80,000. And it isestimated that the 386,000 horsepower shortage will be brought up this year.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister for hydro): Where does the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) see that 380,000?

MR. DENNISON: If you will look at the 1947-48 reports you will find the figures. It states there that ther is a shortage of 386,000 horsepwoer.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: The figures are not correct. We have not refused a customer any power.

MR. DENNISON: This is the picture I am giving you. I give you the picture of our report at page 19, of 1948, the hydro report. And we are dealing there with the potential peak. That is for all possible demands, primary and secondary, which otherwise would be 3,150,000 horsepower.

HON. MR. CHALLIES: If there was not sufficient water there might be a shortage.

MR. DENNISON: The hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) will be aware of the fact that we have literally thousands of people in the province who make it possible to provide the domestic power.

MR. CHALLIES: I will not challenge that. You name hundreds of municipalities. I would like to know them.

MR. DENNISON: For one thing today in Toronto you are getting power fromsome industries to help the hydro. You were doing that a year ago. There must be a shortage.

MR. CHALLIES: That is before the rains.

MR. DENNISON: I wouldlike to review this whole situation; I think it is important if there is no shortage at the present time. If there is no shortage we are dealing with a serious situation. I think there will be a shortage of 386,000 horsepower, because if we have not a shortage when I give these figures, you will see how serious the situation may be.

In 1950 we are going to have 456,000 horsepower. Hydro says 616,500. We are going to have from the Des Joachims 240,000 horsepower, from the Tunnel Station 56,500, Pine Portage, 80,000. And package units 80,000 horsepower. And according to the reports it is 616,500.

According to the advertisements which were placed inthe papers on the 4th day of January this year, according to the advertisements, you are bringing into production this year 616,500 horsepower. That is more than my figure. Mine are 456,000.

MR. CHALLIES: That must be right.

MR. DENNISON: We are taking our shortage of 386,000 horsepower if we accept that. Our real growth of hydro in this province as I see it, over the past ten years, amounts to 82,000. Over the past twenty years our primary growth amounted to 75,000 horsepower. Our biggest real growth took place in 1940 when we increased our growth 170,000.

Under the Stone and Webster system the annual growth for five years after the war was 104,000.

Now, what figures do we get. At the end of 1950 I figure you will have enough power available to supply the shortages and with a tiny bit over with unusual rain. In 1951 what will happen? We will have the Des Joachims 240,000 horsepower. The Windsor

steam plant 160,000. Chenaux 240,000. That will leave a surplus of 460,000 horsepower.

In 1952 we will bring in LaCave with 204,000 horsepower and thenthe Toronto steamplant with 228,000, making a total for 1952 of 792,000.

Assuming on the usual growth in 1953 we will have Niagara Falls with 500,000 horsepower, bringing up our surplus to 1,192,000 horsepower.

It seems to me we have to look at the figures and we have to remember our surplus. A 10 per cent. excess has been suggested as a normal excess against line failure and low water and to keep a normal service so that we are able to provide the necessary power at all times.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): What about expansion of business?

MR. DENNISON: You will have to expand at only 80,000 horsepower yearly.

(Take C follows)

MR. CHALLIES: We have doubled our demand in ten years. All I can say about this sort of remark --

MR. DENNISON: I would be surprised if that happened, that the government would want to leave anything to government enterprise, but I think would rather leave everything to free enterprise. Let us look at the tremendous increase in the new generation we are bringing in. In 1951, 1952, and 1953, we will bring in an average of 500,000 horsepower against a possible growth of 100,000 horsepower.

MR. CHALLIES: May I give the figure? In 1939, the total amount was 7,599,000,000 kilowatt hours; in 1949, it was 13,364,000,000. There is practically a one hundred per cent increase in ten years.

MR. DENNISON: That is spread over the whole year.

MR. CHALLIES: Of course it is.

MR. DENNISON: I am talking about the average available horsepower, because in your own report, under the heading I have quoted, that figure is given.

The question naturally arises, is this government again heading us into large, unsold, surpluses of power, and the high costs, and increasing increases of such surpluses, to the municipalities of this province? Let us look at what happened in Ontario once before, when we found ourselves with an unsold surplus of power, and as we look at these figures, I am sure the hon. members of the House will agree that from the standpoint of our publicly-owned hydro electric system in this province, it is much more disastrous to hydro to have surplus power than to have a shortage. A shortage is disastrous to the consumer, but a surplus is certainly disastrous to hydro.

Let us take what happened between the years 1930 and

1935, when we found ourselves with a surplus, not nearly as much as the possible surplus I have indicated here, but when we found ourselves with a surplus of power. The hydro reserve dropped in that period from 14,000,000 down to 3,780,000, a tragic drop. The cost of hydro to the municipalities was increased by ten dollars per horsepower, which is a total increase of fifty per cent. Still the hydro was losing money at the rate of $3.00 a horsepower, on every horsepower it sold to the municipalities. At that time it was costing Toronto $2,383,000. per year; it was costing Hamilton $852,000. per year, extra, and was costing London $265,000. per year.

The Hydro in that time had purchased over 30,000,000 horsepower it could not use, and could not sell. It seems to me that we have to start some serious planning in regard to this question if we are going to avoid getting ourselves into the other end of the problem, and I would suggest to the government, and to the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) that it is his responsibility to properly plan the new generation of hydro electric power in this province, so as to avoid huge unsold surpluses.

MR. DUNBAR: Saunders should never have taken you on that airplane ride. You are still away up in the air.

MR. DENNISON: The hon. minister (Mr. Challies) should estimate or plan an estimate of future growth. We have none of these figures, except what we get in the hydro advertisements, and these reports, and I am sorry to say that sometimes these reports are over one year old when we get them.

Mr. Speaker, it will require planning to keep ahead of the demand, but not too far ahead.

I know it goes against the Tory grain to plan. The Tories love to trip along like the little lambs in the meadows, until the night comes, and they get into a black-out period, and then they wonder where the shelter is.

I do not think the government should leave this to guess work. I think they should be able to assure this House just where they stand on the matter, and if I may refer to the question raised by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and which I raised last year, too, I think this question of half-and-half development of the Ottawa river enters into whether we are going to have surpluses or not. If you are going to give one-half of the power from the Ottawa Valley to the province of Quebec, then probably you would not have a surplus. If you are going to keep all of the power we are developing now in the Ottawa Valley, then I say you have to look seriously into the question of those surpluses. I do not think this proposal to give half of the power to our sister province, from the Ottawa Valley, is a business-like proposition at all. That proposal was hatched in a Montreal hotel room between two prime ministers. They had no hydro engineer along with them when they hatched the proposal. I do not think the government should entertain that idea for a minute. If we give one-half of the power from our four sites, we would be forced to build transmission lines from three of the sites --

MR. CHALLIES: Mr. Speaker, I think a statement like that should be challenged. He said, "two prime ministers in a Montreal hotel room hatched up some hydro agreement". The hon. Premier of this province (Mr. Drew) denied we are getting all the power from the province of Quebec.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I can hunt up the reference--

MR. CHALLIES: It is not worthwhile. Go ahead.

MR. DENNISON: The point I wanted to bring in was covered by the hon. Premier (Mr. Drew) on page 1296 of the 1946 Hansard, in which he said:

> "Although we are going ahead to develop these sites, the province of Quebec could at any time they wanted to, demand their one-half of the power by paying one-half of the construction costs."

MR. CHALLIES: As it is now, the province of Ontario has all the power they can use from three new plants.

MR. DENNISON: I am glad the House has that settled. I am glad the government has at last settled this question, so that the power we generate will come to the province of Ontario. Otherwise, we would be in a situation of hopeless confusion. We would have to build transmission lines to all of the sites on the Ottawa, if we were only getting one-half of the power, and that would increase the operating expenses, and increase the staff, and increase the --

MR. CHALLIES: We are doing it anyway.

MR. DENNISON: I am happy that the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) made that point clear.

I would like to deal for a moment now with the rate increases. This House paid for the services of Stone and Webster, and Clarkson, Gordon and Company, to investigate the Hydro, and more or less give us a picture of what we could expect in the next five years to come.

If the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) will go back over these reports, he will find out that the House has the assurance that there will not be an increase in cost of Hydro until 1954. We were told in these reports that the average net cost

was $16.89 per horsepower for hydro to the municipalities, and on top of that there was $4.03 for contingencies, and that $4.03 of a cushion was going to carry us along until 1954.

No wonder the municipalities were amazed when they got the extra bill, and the intimation that the cost of hydro was going up $2.00 a horsepower.

The reports we had, I believe, were based on facts. The Clarkson report went into the estimated construction costs at Des Joachims, and they estimated the construction costs at De Cow Falls, at Stewartville, the Aguasabon, the Chenoaux, Le Cave, the Tunnel Site, and so on, and with their estimates of these construction costs, they said it was not necessary to increase the cost of hydro to the consumers until 1954.

But here, four years before 1954, we get the bill --

MR. CHALLIES: Read that in the report.

MR. DENNISON: Yes, I can read it. I will be very glad to read it. I have the report here. This (indicating) is from a summary --

MR. CHALLIES: Oh, read the report.

MR. DENNISON: -- of the summary concerning the provisions of the frequency standards and the costs.

MR. CHALLIES: Wait now, Mr. Speaker. I presume the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) wants to be factual.

MR. DENNISON: That is true.

MR. CHALLIES: That (indicating) says that as far as conversion is concerned, there will be no increase to the municipality, which is true. The fact is, that the increase is due to the increased costs of capital construction, coming into the picture.

MR. DENNISON: I agree with the hon. minister (Mr.

Challies) when he says it is not the result of the change-over to 60 cycle, because we have barely started to change over yet. As far as I can find out, the change-over is running along within the estimated costs, so far. That is not the reason. I just pointed out to the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) that these construction co were investigated.

MR. CHALLIES: I asked the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) if he would read from the report, and he quoted the increase of capital costs, and picks up a pamphlet concerning frequency conversion.

MR. DENNISON: Yes, this is frequency conversion, but also deals with the cost of power.

MR. CHALLIES: Due to frequency conversion.

MR. DENNISON: Oh no, it does not.

MR. CHALLIES: I say it does.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. DENNISON: It deals with the over-all cost of power, as well as frequency conversion.

May I point out in regard to the argument the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) has just put forward that it is increased capital costs which is responsible for the increase in rates. I want the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) to give us an instance of an increase in capital costs. He built the Aguasabon, generating, for less than the estimated capital cost. I understand the De Cew Falls generating plant was built for less than the estimated costs, and also the Stewartville Site, and the Des Joachim was built for less than the estimated cost.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): No, it was doubled.

MR. CHALLIES: You had better get together.

MR. DENNISON: The trend for future power costs, as given in this review, states this:

"Power costs are estimated at a trend upward in future years. By 1954, when the present planned program of new construction is completed, it is estimated that the over-all average cost of power will be approximately $22."

That is in 1954, when the program is completed. But here we are, four years before 1954, raising the cost to $22.

Then it says:

"In 1964, it is presupd that the figure will be reduced again to $20.92".

That is in your own report, -- in the summary of your own report, Mr. Minister. So I would like to have the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) give the House the exact reasons for these increases in costs to the municipalities. It seems to me a tragedy that in Ontario, under public ownership, we should have increasing costs of our hydro electric power, whereas in Manitoba, under public ownership, they are decreasing theirs, and in Saskatchewan, they are decreasing theirs.

Now, at the present time, the hydro is borrowing money at the cheapest rate in history. That should offset to some extent the increase in operating costs, because, after all, one of your great costs in any of these projects is the cost of borrwing money. These people in this country who recklessly blew the lid off price ceilings in 1946, 1947 and 1948, should share the responsibility for these increases of costs. If that is true, the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) should say so, because inside his party were some of the men who were the most violent advocates of blowing the lid off the price controls when the war was over. We are now reaping

the benefits in the deflation of the Canadian dollar, and that has certainly affected the pocketbooks, and the whole price structure in this country, in a very detrimental way.

Now, the critical shortages of hydro have passed. I think that is certain. From here on out, I think this province is entitled to scientific, careful planning to bring an improved situation in such a way, or we will all find ourselves in the other equally bad situation of having huge unsold surpluses, and the increases in rates because of the huge unsold surpluses.

I think we have to get away from the disorderly planning of the type which caused us to buy more power than we could sell in the 30's, and the "too little and too late" type which caused us to have less power than we required in the 40's. Just because the Hydro at the present time has the know - how and the equipment to bulldoze its way through these new projects at a very fast rate, and with great speed, is no reason why we should bring into production hydro electric power in this province faster than we can use it.

I will also direct the attention of the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) to the fact that one of the recommendations made by these experts was that the hydro electric commission itself be increased, and in this House, on the 27th of March, 1947, the then Premier (Mr. Drew) promised an increase in the number of the Hydro Electric Commission, raising the number from three to nine members. He promised he was going to give representation to labour, he was giving to give representation to the housewives, and he was going to give representation to agriculture, and to new Ontario. We are still waiting for a Bill to be brought before this House, to implement those promises.

MR. MacLEOD: We passed the Bill.

MR. DENNISON: Oh, no.

MR. MacLEOD: Oh, yes.

MR. DENNISON: Have we passed the Bill?

MR. MacLEOD: Yes.

MR. DENNISON: I am sorry. I did not know we went that far. We passed the Bill, but the government did not implement the Bill. That is something like a promise you made to the poor returned soldiers, in regard to life insurance premiums. You passed the Bill to help them, and then did not implement the Bill.

It seems to me the Hydro is in the same position today.

In closing, I would like to draw the hon. minister's (Mr. Challies) attention to a resolution passed by many of the municipalities. I have two of them before me, and I understand they are being constantly passed by various municipalities. These municipalities complain that when the Hydro builds a power line, it does not make an effort to avoid the fields of the farmers; it puts hydro towers in the middle of farmers' fields, without asking the farmer at all.

A farmer from up at Fraserville wrote to me last summer and said that in his country, when the weather was dry, and there was great danger of forest fires, he saw a forest fire in his bush, and he rushed down with a shovel and a pail to put the fire out, and when he got there, he found a hydro crew busy whacking a 30-foot path through his bush. He asked them what they were doing, and the foreman said they were told to do it, and he said, "Have you permission"? and he was

told, "We do not need permission". He went to the manager, and the manager apologized for not asking him, and this man in his letter said, "Dennison, if this is an example of public ownership, I do not know whether it is good or not". I think we have a responsibility to establish good relationships with the people with whom we come in contact. I think the Hydro has improved its relationship a great deal in regard to the local farmers, and I suggest it is very important to improve that relationship, but there is no reason why a foreman should not go in and explain the situation to the farmer, and interview him, before he starts his job.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to this annual slaughter of opposition bills by the administration in power. I think it is one of the weak points in our democracy, that this should take place. I believe this government could greatly increase the prestige of this House in the years to come, by clearing the Order Paper every year, and be prepared to stand up and be counted on these issues, rather than kill them by the expediency of not calling the Order Paper.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: Let me review some of the important legislation which was killed by that expedient last year. Last year we had a Bill which would have provided for the municipal distribution of milk, a Bill recommended by your own Royal Commission on Milk. Never called.

We had a Bill which would give two weeks' holidays with pay. Never called.

I am glad the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) is here today, because there was another Labour Bill, too, a

Bill to establish the 40-hour week with a minimum of overtime in any year, and to provide time and one-half for that overtime. That Bill was not called.

We had a Bill of Rights Act, a Bill to protect the democratic rights of all people in the province against discrimination on the part of anyone because of race, nationality, or religion, in matters of employment, education, and right of access to any public building. That Bill was not called.

We had a Bill permitting cities to establish municipal forests in the same way, and having the same right, as counties. That Bill was never called.

We had a Bill to require a blood test for syphilis before marriage; not called.

We had a Bill to require landlords to supply a minimum of heat, when they had contracted to do so, in the lease or the agreement.

These Bills were placed before this Legislature, I take it, for serious consideration, by both the government and the Opposition.

According to the rules of this Legislature, two days a week should be set aside for the discussion of private members' Bills. Apparently, because a very bad tradition has sprung up in this House in years gone by, this democratic right was not exercised, and we have now reached the point where we have less than the democratic right. I would urge this government to re-establish the democratic rights of the private members of this House and bring legislation forward, and I would urge the government to have the courage to stand up and debate these issues, man to man. Do not hide behind the expediency of not calling the orders; stand up and be counted, as we are prepared

to stand up and be counted on these important public questions.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Take D follows)

MR. CHARLES W. COX (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, in continuing the debate on the Speech fromthe Throne I wish to join with the others in offering my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Reynolds) and the seconder (Mr. Leger), and I am sure they will make substantial contributions to the deliberations in this House and to Mr. Speaker, who is not here at the moment, I offer my congratulations for the most capable manner in which he is carrying on his duty. He is also a charming host, and we are indebted to him for his kind hospitality. I also want to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Gemmell) and to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Hamilton) upon their elevation to Cabinet rank.

I represent one of the most important ridings in northwestern Ontario and it is my duty to speak on some matters which vitally affect us there; one is the handling of our natural resources, and I wish to offer some constructive criticism.

The resources in this riding occupy a very important position in the economic life of Canada and more particularly up there around the lakehead, and I am of the opinion that the possibilities and potentialities of this great area are not fully realized and that strong action should be taken to rectify the gross errors of the past in the disposition of these great national assets. I hope that some action will be taken to rectify these past errors.

But before discussing the resourcqs in my riding, I want to bring to your attention one or two things on which I would like some action fromthe government. I am sure that our present government will do everything possible to rectify these deplorable situations now existing in respect to our resources.

I would like to congratulate the government for same action taken recently at that very important portion of northern Ontario, the head of the lakes. The government has commenced a project on

which they must be commended, and that is the completion of the mental hospital in the district. During the term of the Liberal administration under the leadership of hon. Mitchell Hepburn, one among many good acts which they accomplished was to make a start on a mental hospital there; an administration building was constructed and extensive preliminary work completed necessitat-in the expenditure of a large sum of money at that time. Then the war interrupted, preventing the continuing of the construction.

Now this government has decided to carry on and complete the much needed hospital. And I am sure the people at the lake head are most grateful for the evidence of good faith in completing this long overdue project, which will undoubtedly be of great benefit to the north. Another thing that was discussed for a long time but never came about, was making it possible for a large number of easternmembers to visit the northwest last summer. I sincerely trust you all enjoyed the trip and learned something regarding the immense possibilities. We are indeed very grateful to the hon. Mr. Scott (Minister of Lands and Forests). He was most active in making this educational trip possible. And I wish to thank our friend from Huron (Mr. Pryde) who made some nice remarks about the possibilities of the north.

And I thank our friend Miss Macphail (York, East), when she said she was impressed with what she saw. In fact, if more people talked the way she did and said what she said, the potentialities in my riding would be brought home much quicker to the rest of the province. Among other things which the member (Miss Macphail) said, she said she felt welcome and she was pleased with the reception she received. Among other things, the hon members who came up, saw some of our resources being developed, like Terrace Bay. The hon. member (Miss Macphail) said she felt sure that something could be done to develop these great resources in Canada by Canadian people.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: Withthis arrangement I am entirely in agreement. I hope that she (Miss Macphail) will come back.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York, East): Thank you.

MR. COX: I think she (Miss Macphail) gave the crowd a kind of respectability.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: They needed it.

MR. COX: Now, hon. members, I want to say something about our resources and something about hydro, and I would like to mention more particularly the Aguasabon. You may recall this development was discussed during the last Session. Recent hydro statements indicating the amountof money which has already been expended convinces me more than ever as to the unsoundness of the undertaking. It was unsound and impracticable and was put there for the express purpose of serving a private company by the Canadian people.

I cannot agree about the cost, that it was within the estimates. I am sure it was not in accordance with the facts. I think the original hydro estimate of the cost was to have been approximately $10,000,000 and thatthe cost today, according to reports, the figures were unavailable, I think the costs today are over $15,000,000, and I doubt the plant will ever develop 30,000 horsepower. I do hope that the promise made last year by hon.Mr. Kennedy, the then leader of the government, and this year by the hon.. Mr.Frost (Prime Minister), that they will take it out of the Thunder Bay system and put it under Ontario rural system, will be kept, and relieve the people of the lakehead of an unjustified burden. I do feel that something is wrong when it is represented by an hydro official that this development is political dynamite. I heard a few members from the south complain of their inability to get cement for some jobs. I sympathize with them. On one job at the head of the

lakes there is enough cement to make a sidewalk four feet wide and six inches thick and 400 miles long. The job should never have been begun in the first place. You can readily observe what an extremely high cost project this is and I repeat my opinion that it is nothing but a scheme to use the lakeheads for a private company to create an artificial lake to store their logs.

AN hon. MEMBER: A log plant.

MR. COX: No. For Long Lac Pulp and Paper Company. It is using public funds and creating an artificial lake to store logs and pulpwood for their benefit.

And perhaps something else, they are continuing flooding the lakes by the erection of power dams for the purpose of creating power. I am not criticizing our hydro.

I do think, and I think my friend across the way should also consider the possibility before water levels should rise that some consideration be given to clearing the trees which are so affected by the rise of the water. I have some pictures taken out of the Kennedy report which indicate the logs. I will send one or two across the line. And I am sure Miss Macphail would like to look at these. I am passing some more along in her direction. The loss on raising these waters is beyond comprehension. I will take the simple history of one lake. On one lake in northern Ontario approximately 500 miles of shore line has been flooded from one to fifteen feet. Enough timber has been destroyed to supply a reasonably large pulp mill for many years. The lake and the shore line presents a picture of colossal waste and will remain as a menace to navigation and other operations for at least another fifty years.

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Was that the hydro?

MR. COX: Yes.

HON. MR. SCOTT: I thought it was Premier Drew that was opening it.

MR. COX: That is the dam that affects the lake. He was there when it was opened, on the opening day, and he took credit for it. After making the dam possible should he not have completed the dam?

Mr. Speaker, how long would any business remain solvent if it adopted policies of this kind? Provision should have been made to salvage the timber so affected before the water levels were raised.

Now, our timber resources. And this is one point which should concern every member of this Assembly. It is amazing how the citizens generally are becoming interested inthe future of our forests and I know of no phase of our government affairs that requires more attention if we are to preserve and perpetuate this great natural heritage.

This is not the first time I have brought this up before the House. I will read what I said some ten years ago:

> "We have there thousands of square miles of virgin timber with a combination of conditions which naturally lend themselves to the lumber industry. Namely, a climatic condition peculiarly suited for lumbering; long winters with plenty of snow; very extensive stands of accessible timber, traversed by large rivers, making logging and driving facilities excellent, and emptying into the largest body of fresh water on the continent. We are so situated geographically as to be able to take advantage of cheap transportation down the great lakes to some of the largest markets in the world and we have in that country, a sturdy class of people acclimatized to these conditions who are quite capable of carrying

out large undertakings. The timber areas of northern Ontario without a doubt, include some of the best stands of pulpwood in the world, with the potentiality for riches sufficient to satisfy the needs of a nation had they been conscientiously administered for the benefit of the citizens as a whole. Unfortunately for the citizens of this province and to the everla ting disgrace of those entrusted with the safeguarding of this great wealth, the recor s of this department are not the history of a trust well and faithfully performed, but rather they reveal a story of political manipulation for the benefit of a favoured few, carried out with a daring and an utter disregard of the rights of the people almost beyond the realms of fancy."

I think we have an area of timber lands, timber supplies, in larger proportion than anything else. I think we have an area of timber land which if properly administered and properly cut, it would maintain the population in perpetuity. But if the present rate continues and fires continue to take their toll, it is a matter of only a few years until that area will be changed all through. The tops all will be ruined and burned and it will be an area of desolation and waste. That is what will happen in northern Ontario just as sure as the sun rises in the east. There are plenty of authorities in the Kennedy report along the same line. I will not go into the details. I think he said at the present rate of cutting in another twenty-five years there would be no saw mills. I will not read all these articles I have when I say a number of citizens are concerned. Here is an article from the "Forester"---"Canadian policies are all wrong." And then there is the Kennedy report. These remarks were made some time ago and nothing has been done about it. As a matter of fact, if you read these you will see that they state in effect that the

agreements made between various companies, that these agreements were granted to the advantage of certain companies and that sharp practices were exercised inthe making of these agreements. Nothing should be more clear than that there should be a clarification of these and how they were exercised. I want to say something about the agreements and I will come back to that again.

The monopolistic control of a few companies in northern Ontario has been and will be if not corrected, most detrimental to the welfare of northern Ontario.

SOME hon.MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: We can take the Marathon Paper Company. They control an area of something like 6000 square miles. The Long Lac Pulp and Paper Company, 7204 square miles. The Abitibi Pulp and Paper Company 8873 square miles. The Brompton Pulp and Paper Company 3000 square miles.

Square miles perhaps do not convey so much, but to get it into language that you might understand it is this---they control 23,300 square miles of timber land. That is an area almost twice that of Belgium. It is larger than Switzerland. Larger than Southern Ireland. Almost half as large as Old Ontario, and from Lake Erie the other way.

Many of these agreements carry the right to export wood. I think it is reported that these companies have exercised some control for the right to export wood over 10,000 miles, an area larger than Belgium. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, a study reveals agreements which have been entered into between many outside companies and the province are certainly one-sided and most detrimental to the best interests of Ontario. We are forced to the conclusion that when these agreements were consummated, either collusion, political corruption or utter stupidity onthe part of those representing the province must have been involved. You have no other conclusion. It is no wonder that Canadians are

leaving every year, when we are exporting that amount of wood. There are all kinds of uses for wood. As I have mentioned---I think I mentioned before, I wore clothes made of wood.

Mr. Drew said he would rectify this situation.

Surely with the ever-increasing use of wood in different products we are faced with a better future than other people. I think these resources should be manufactured in Canada by Canadians for Canadians.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: That is where the sharp practice came in.

We heard a lot of talk about the capital invested by our friends to the south. Yes, they invested capital. But the capital which they invested is a bagatelle in relation to the resources they control.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: I cannot altogether agree with my hon. friend from Fort Frances (Mr. Newman). I know he is a pleasant sort of fellow.

AN HON. MEMBER: As long as he does not swing the white-wash brush.

MR. COX: I think the people who invested their money in Steep Rock should remember that it was originally Canadian money and they are deserving of credit. I agree with my friend as to the magnitude of the operations and the possibilities but I cannot agree to a subsidy which is making possible the continued cooperation without ore or anything. We should find a way of processing this ore in Canada.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: What was done before, and I don't think my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) will disagree---I see he has disappeared.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): He is here.

MR. COX: I think we can come back to that again. I think that what was done then was justified by the results. It was in

1934 to 1937 Algoma was not operating at the Soo. It required assistance not only at the beginning but help to get the plant going. They came into the House to ask for assistance in getting organized and asked for some assistance by way of subsidies. The plant was not operating. I have not the details. I know what Mr. Hepburn did then. They put an Act through to the effect that there would be a subsidy. My hon. friends might remember that Bill. The subsidy which they had in mind made up a large part of the original requirements, I am not saying that was the whole justification. The result was that under Hepburn they did get a subsidy to resume production of Canadian ore. The mills started shortly after and 5,000 have worked at the Soo ever since.

It is not outside the realm of possibility that some similar action might happen at Steep Rock so we can produce and develop the ore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, about fire. We have had no fires for the last few days. This is a most serious problem and machinery might be set up to protect our timber. The loss is 40 per cent too hight. I intend to introduce a resolution on that subject.

I wish you all could come up North again, and see what a few have done for the people already.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: I am going to introduce a resolution -- it is not yet prepared -- making certain recommendations about a Committee. If I am permitted to join such a Committee I would appreciate it. I think that the hon. members of this House should form a Committee so that they could familiarize themselves and become acquainted with what is going on in Northern Ontario. I am sure that they would be most impressed. I think you should become better acquainted with Northern Ontario and I am sure that whomever should come up

would all subscribe to the comment made by the hon. member (Miss McPhail) she was there. I said before and I say again that when you do come up there, let me take you on a trip at no expense to the government. I will take you gratis. I have been going into the United States for many years and I will take you across the border into Wisconsin. That is one of the most prosperous spots on the continent. I will drive you one day to points that you will in 20 to 25 miles see an expanding picture.

There is no unemployment in thatstate, and much of its population is working on Canadian wood. Just come upand make the trip. It will be at no expense to the government. As I said, it will be gratis. You will find that it will be a real revelation.

I want to do something about unemployment. We hear a lot about it but little is done. I am not criticizing that too much. Unemployment in many cases islike fires. They are man made.

Monopoly control has to a large degree much to do with unemployment at the head of the lakes. These four companies I mentioned control the people body and soul. Domestic mils are not cutting any wood, they cut enough to last for three years. Why? It should not be permitted. A year or so ago those mills cut thousandsof cords of wood. They cut more than they required. And they brought in people from Halifax to Vancouver to work. And this year, the people who came in and next year with no cutting they will be on relief.

This operation should be controlled. They should not be permitted to cut more than their requirements.

(Take E follows)

There should be a levelling off in order to keep a gradual amount of employment, it should not be a feast or famine fluctuation. That cutting should be controlled.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Do you think the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) will agree?

MR. COX: I do not think he would disagree. I am not criticizing D.P's., but that work is being done by D.P's. Unfortunately we have D.P's. coming in the front door and our Canadians are going out the back door. No question about that. I am not saying anything about the D.P's., but how are you going to develop this country, how are you going to keep Canadians at home if you are just going to make hewers of wood and drawers of water of them? Canadians like some fine work to do. They are not all pulpwood cutters, not all loggers, they do not all make ties. Go to Wisconsin and see the work Canadians like to do in the manufacturing end of these resources.

We are educating our young people, and they are going over to the other side of the line, and taking advantage of the cost of education in Ontario and Canada, and you will never develop this country or keep Canadians in Canada -- there are more Canadians in the United States than in Canada. We are losing them every year. You are never going to develop this country that way. It is not a provincial matter, but I do not think you will until you properly develop these Canadian resources by Canadian people.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: I want to say something now about fires. Fires are nearly all man-made in the forests. Some are due to carelessness, and some are considered deliberate. The loss from fires has been something colossal. I think the

practice of handling forest fires could be improved upon. I do not say this in a way critical of my hon. friend (Mr. Scott), I think he is making an honest effort.

I think we have too many technical men and not enough practical men running these jobs. I think consideration should be given to employing, not a greater number at one time, but having a permanent force of woodsmen to extinguish fires. It is a woodsman's job.

What happens when there is a forest fire? Forest fires have developed into a harvest. When there is a forest fire at the Lakehead -- and we have more fires there than anyplace else, and fires are more prevalent in times of depression than at any other time; I have gone through that -- when we have a forest fire at the Lakehead, and there will be forest fires this spring if things do not pick up --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COX: What do they do? They broadcast the countryside for men to put out the forest fires. And invariably, who do they get? Totally inexperienced people, many of them "broke". Now, what kind of fire-fighters do you think they would make? Do you think they would be very enthusiastic about putting out a forest fire when they have had nothing to eat for a few days, and when they put the forest fire out, they put themselves out of a job?

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Let us have them up for arson.

MR. COX: You would have a fine time catching them out in the bush. I think consideration should be given also to the use of helicopters. I watched those work a good deal down in the south, not altogether in the forest, but I think if they could be put into practical operation with a few trained

woodsmen who would not get lost -- most of these experts you have, my friend (Mr. Scott), they are not bushmen, they would get lost in a hotel, much less the woods.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COX: There should be an organization of trained bushmen. A few trained bushmen who tackle a forest fire shortly after it is started can quite easily extinguish it, but once the forest fire makes headway, an army cannot put it out and frequently the loss is colossal. It is a job for trained men, I think.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think consideration should be given to a greater degree of developing our national resources by Canadians, and I think some steps should be taken to make a survey of all those contracts which have been made down through the years. I hope my hon. friend representing the Hydro (Mr. Challies) will see to it that that unjustifiable burden is taken off the people at the Head of the Lakes in connection with the Aguasabon. I hope also ways may be found for the development to a much greater degree of our ore in Canada. I want to reiterate and repeat that these contracts which have been entered into should be condemned in the strongest possible terms.

In this book by Mr. Gilmore, which covers all the forestry problems in Canada, he said, among other things:

> "One would be exceedingly naive if he thought there was not corruption in the handling of these resources".

And I suggest he was very modest when he said that.

MR. MacLEOD: That is a piece of British understatement.

MR. COX: I think, having regard to the surrounding circumstances -- look at this, you read more about the north

than you do any place else, but look at this from one of our local papers, a whole page, "The Battle of Giants".

MR. MacLEOD: Who are the giants?

MR. COX: Well, I am not going to try to describe the giants, but listen to what one very capable reporter says -- I think it is quite significant:

> "The impartial observer who attempts to get at the truth finds himself in a veritable hornet's nest of controversy. Almost everybody is biased one way or the other, but there is general agreement on one point, that politics and the dollar sign for the last 50 years have produced a smell in the forest -- and the smell isn't pine".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COX: Having regard to all those circumstances, having regard to what Mr. Kennedy said in his report -- and after all, Mr. Speaker, that report cost the people $141,000., and I do not know what is being done about it -- the implication in that report is that there is something wrong. Unsound practices were used; the public were not protected -- nothing could be plainer than that. No other implications could be taken from that report, and I think it is the duty of any government, having regard to the circumstances -- for years we have talked about the maladministration of the forest, and I think it is the duty of any government to make a thorough study to find out the facts and correct what appears to be a rather deplorable situation.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion -- and perhaps I have talked too long -- I will be presenting a resolution at some subsequent time. I ask hon. members to consider --

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) has it there.

MR. COX: Oh, I have plenty more if you want me to go on. I never get tired of talking about this. I am afraid you would feel worse, though. I am not criticizing the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) at all.

MR. MacLEOD: He is one of the nicest members in the House.

MR. COX: I will say this for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar); I have had a rather long and varied experience with Ministers of Municipal Affairs in a public way, and I can assure hon. members of this House that any dealings which any municipalities I was associated with had with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) were most satisfactory and commendable indeed.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Take a bow, George.

MR. COX: Mr. Speaker, in closing -- you were not in, Mr. Speaker, when I spoke before; I complimented you on the most capable manner in which you have carried out the duties of the House, and I also did say that you have proven to be a very excellent host, and I am sure we are indebted to you for your time and generous hospitality and to your good wife.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, allow me to summarize my remarks. I ask the hon. members of this House to consider the huge amount of public funds which has been unnecessarily expended on a project to make possible the operation of a private company. I ask them to consider the colossal waste

as a result of fire of Ontario's forests, much of which should and could be prevented. I ask them to consider the wilful waste of enormous quantities of Ontario's timber, brought about in the erection of dams thereby flooding immense areas. I ask them to considerable the almost incredible lack of business sense exercised in negotiations for the disposition of Ontario's natural resources. And, Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. members, finally, to consider the unsoundness of a policy which permits the exporting of unprocessed material to points outside Ontario, thereby creating employment with these, our resources, elsewhere. I ask the hon. members to consider all these things, and I am sure they will be as convinced as I am that there is something rotten in Denmark.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. B. L. CATHCART (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, as an elected member of the party which forms our present government, I have questioned just what contribution I could make in this debate, especially in view of the fact that every single piece of legislation brought into this House is already thoroughly discussed in caucus beforehand, with the result that we, as government members, have had full opportunity to express our views. However, as the debate goes on, one is impressed with the wild scramble on the part of the Opposition to find things to criticize. In other words, the kind of government the people of this great province are receiving is above reproach and the members opposite are hard pressed in advancing any real criticism.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): You dreamer.

MR. CATHCART: As an alternative, it seems that some have resorted to, what has been mentioned before, as spreading Blue Ruin or the gospel of gloom. It is my hope to do what I can to lift them out of their despondency by bringing to their attention a little of the brighter side of the picture.

Before doing so, I would like to make some personal references and tributes to certain hon. members of this House.

Like those who have spoken before me, I do want to express my sincere sympathy to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley) and the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell) in their illness, and to join with this House in saying may they be speedily restored to health and be able once more to take up their many duties and responsibilities. While on this particular subject, I know I will only be expressing the thoughts of all of us in saying how glad we were to see the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Nault) back in his seat, if only for the brief time which his health and strength permitted. May I add they are greatly missed by all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to congratulate personally the mover and the seconder of the motion which launched this debate. I must say in view of the rather poor accoustics of the Chamber, it was a real pleasure to discover the hon. member from Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) has a booming voice that could be heart without difficulty throughout the Chamber. There is no doubt in my mind that, with a few years of experience, he will present a real challenge to the hon. member from Grey South (Mr. Oliver). It was also a treat to listen to the well delivered speech of the hon. member for North Cochrane (Mr. Leger). The

remarks from both were a real contributionto this House.

I must not overlook, also, the fact that our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), in making his debut as the government leader in this Session, has not only lived up to his previous record of getting things done without delay, but has that rare accomplishment of doing this in such a genial manner that he has the Opposition agreeing with him, more often than not.

Is that loud enough?

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Very loud. You are learning. I was just saying you did not think so a year ago.

MR. CATHCART: As the member for the constituency of Lambton West, which has both Sarnia and Point Edward in it, it is only natural that I should make some mention of the work that the Department of Travel and Publicity is doing. There has been the odd doubt in the minds of some, perhaps, whether this Department, which is not direct revenue producing, justifies its existence. From our experience, where we play the part of host to many thousands, I, for one, can say it definitely has. The tourist reception bureau which the Department maintains at the Blue Water bridge in Point Edward, last year had more registrations of visitors than any other point of entry in the Province, with the exception of Niagara Falls. Roughly 85,000 visitors registered at the bureau during the 1949 season, and practically all of these were tourists who were to stay in our province for 48 hours or more. In other words, they were in no sense transient visitors.

The impact of these visitors upon an economy can be realized when one recalls that the Dominion Bureau of

Statistics estimates that more than $200,000,000. or roughly two-thirds of all the tourist dollars spent in Canada were spent in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, these are U.S. dollars of which we are sorely in need.

I might add, however, that we mustnot think alone of the monetary value of the tourist business. Even a greater asset is the friendship and understanding that comes from our personal contact with our neighbours from the south. There is a saying that first impressions are the most lasting. The Department of Travel and Publicity, with its exceptionally high standard of personnel, through its reception depots does a tremendous and important job in making these first impressions of the best.

I have no hesitation in saying that it is the responsibility of the government to encourage the tourists to come to this province. Once they arrive, it becomes the responsibility of the public generally and of the business men -- hotel and resort and service station operators, et cetera -- in particular to develop and expand that first good impression, by treating them fairly and courteously at all times.

In connection with this, I have often thought what an impression it would make on the people of this province as a whole if a new colour of currency, such as red or some other distinctive colour, was printed for the use of these visitors.

MR. SALSBERG: I second the motion.

MR. CATHCART: If this were feasible, I have no doubt that our people would be amazed at the number of these travel dollars circulating through their pockets and tills.

That might be something for you to consider.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): A dangerous colour.

MR. CATHCART: Talking about travel reminds me to thank the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) for the splendid trip which he arranged for the hon. members through north and northwestern Ontario. It was almost startling to learn of the tremendous developments in that part of the province, and I know the experience was of great benefit to those who made the trek northward. Perhaps the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) could be persuaded to arrange a trip sometime in the near future for the hon. northern members through southwestern Ontario, so they could become similarly acquainted with the older parts of the province.

MR. DENNISON: Like Sarnia?

MR. CATHCART: We did not cover those centres, and certainly if we did, we had not the opportunity to see the immense development on our own as we did when under the guidance of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott), and in the same way, if those of the north would come down, we could probably amaze them at the development that has taken place down here.

MR. DUNBAR: Come down and see eastern Ontario.

MR. CATHCART: Eastern? I will have to get directions from you to get ideas.

A great deal of the growth of our tourist business can be attributed to the foresight of our capable hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in the development of the vast network of roads throughout this province. Aside from the treatment that we, as individuals, accord to our visitors, I doubt if there is any other single factor that creates a

greater impression than our smooth, well-marked highways, and because of the grants to municipalities, we have today good road systems as connecting links for those highways. The fact that they are not cluttered up with a forest of billboards, such as exists in some states, must also be appreciated by our visitors.

MR. DENNISON: How about the "Pull Up Ahead" signs?

MR. CATHCART: Our genial Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) is worthy of headlines also, for the legislation brought forward during this session which will provide cheap interest money to assist municipalities in building much needed services such as waterworks and sewage systems. He must be complimented. I am sure you will agree that the full benefits of this measure will be borne out with the passage of time.

May I also say a word about the Department of Reform Institutions, particularly concerning the Brampton institution. This reformatory which cares for the youth who have gotten into difficulty with the law, is carrying out perhaps the most important bit of rehabilitation work in the province -- or in the world. It teaches these young men trades that will assist them in re-establishing themselves and is doing exceptionally fine work in that respect. Since the school was started just a brief three years ago, more than 80 percent of its enrolment have been trained to such an extent that their re-entry into society was accomplished smoothly and without a hitch. This new system, established by the present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) will stand as a memorial to him. Our government was fortunate indeed to have a man of the calibre of our present hon. Minister (Mr. Hamilton) to carry on this very worthwhile work.

I would like to take a moment to make some reference to the Select Committee on Drainage, which made its report to the last Session. It seems that this report has been overshadowed by matters of more spectacular nature. Nonetheless, its recommendations, when carried out, and the legislation put into effect therefrom, will have extremely beneficial results to the farmers of this province. While I admit I was a member of this committee, I have little credit due me; rather, I would like to compliment the hon. member for Kent West (Mr. Parry) for the splendid way in which he carried out his responsibilities as chairman of this little-publicized, but nevertheless highly important committee.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer back to some of my preliminary remarks and thus take issue with the hon. Opposition Leader (Mr. Jolliffe) for his blue ruin or encircling gloom outlook on things in general. It is only necessary for me to draw to his attention one company in Sarnia in order to allay his fears in one sense about our economic future. I refer to Imperial Oil Limited, which operates a vast refinery in that city. Incidentally, I appreciate the gesture of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Pryde), who I see is not in his seat, in using Sarnia as a landmark in locating his own constituency for the benefit of those who were not familiar with its location.

While the ramifications of Imperial's operations are generally known, the developments in the Alberta oilfields and their effect on Sarnia in particular and other parts of the province may not be so well known.

We are all aware of the pipeline which this company has undertaken to build across the prairies. This line

will stretch more than 1,000 miles from Edmonton to Superior, Wisconsin. The steel plate for this pipeline will be rolled by the steel company at Hamilton, and it will be made into pipe by Page-Hershey Tubes, Limited, Welland. The cost of this one contract alone is $8,000,000., all of which will be spent in these two Ontario cities.

You may ask, Mr.Speaker, what effect has this on Sarnia. When the oil reaches Superior, it will be transported by tanker to Sarnia for refining and the Imperial plant there is prepared to handle 36,000 barrels a day. What this will mean in jobs and wages one can readily imagine. There is another important aspect, which will affect Canada as a whole. Once this pipeline is in operation, our imports of oil will be reduced to a point where we will be able to save $30,000,000. annually in those important U.S. dollars.

The pipeline will mean a $550,000. contract for a Fort Eric steelworks; a $280,000. contract for the Fiberglass firm at Oshawa; a $650,000. contract for a Port Arthur company that makes enamel and priming solution and a $107,000. contract for Foster Wheeler Limited, St. Catharines. Of course, there will be other contracts announced once the work gets under way. Some of these items have never before been manufactured in Canada. That means that new jobs are being created. To bear this out, let me quote from the Toronto Globe and Mail of Monday, March 6th:

> "The second electric weld tube mill was completed and began operations in 1949. The new electric resistance weld pipe mill with a production of 4½ to 16 inch outside diameter pipe commenced

"operations late in the year. It is now in full production of 16-inch pipe for oil lines in Western Canada.

"Net additions to the plant and equipment amount to $4,093,616., and this is made up of the expenditure on the 16-inch electric weld buildings and the machinery and the second electric weld tube mill".

(Take F-1 follows)

MR. J. B. SALSBERG(St. Andrew): But the pipeline ends in the United States.

MR. CATHCART: That is only proper.

MR. MacLEOD: From your point of view.

MR. CATHCART: We are deriving the benefit. I am sure you would not ask us to go down through that rock. Do you want the job?

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Drew did not want it in the United States.

MR. CATHCART: I think I should point out, particularly to those who preach the creed of socialism, that this is being done through private enterprise, the principles of which this government supports and promotes.

Before leaving this subject, Mr. Speaker, you will note that the main points I have dealt with concern the effect this great undertaking will have on Ontario. In other words, I have with little difficulty confined my case within the provincial boundaries. Perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will bear this in mind when he is next tempted to wander off on national and international matters, and perhaps he will follow my example.

MISS MACPHAIL: He does not need your example.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): What a hope.

MR. CATHCART: May I tell this little story I read in the paper the other day --

MR. MacLEOD: I think we heard this before.

MR. CATHCART: A law professor was instructing his class, and he said to the students "if you have the facts on your side, hammer them into the jury; if you have the law

on your side, hammer it into the judge; One of the students asked him, "What about if you have neither the law nor the facts?", and the instructor said, "Then hammer on the table".

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York, West): You had better start hammering, right now, then.

(Page F-3 follows)

MR. CATHCART:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the House that this year marks the twentieth anniversary of the Public Welfare Act. As many of the hon. members may recall, it was in 1930 that all the social legislation then in existence was brought under one ministerial head.

The first annual report of the Department of Welfare gave total expenditures for the services involved as approximately $12,000,000. For the current fiscal year, gross expenditures can be reasonably expected to total $52,000,000. -- an increase of more than 400 per cent over that of 20 years ago. What is more revealing is the fact that the increase of the last five years was more than 235 per cent.

The most publicized of the Welfare Department's activities are those relating to Old Age Pensions and Mother's Allowances. However, there is another phase of work which I would like to deal with at this time. That is the protection afforded children -- those of unmarried mothers; those of negligent parents.

This work is the primary responsibility of the local Children's Aid Societies. These societies are made up of unselfish, public spirited citizens, working voluntarily in the interests of children who cannot help themselves. They serve from a sheer desire to protect these children.

In my own constituency, the Children's Aid Society, serving Sarnia and the County of Lambton, composed as it is of unselfish men and women, has been making every effort, and with some considerable success, to build up a staff capable of providing the best service possible for these children.

In the Bulletin of the Child Welfare League of

America for May, 1946, there is an article on Protective Services for Children. This article says, in part:

> "In our society the responsibility for the care and protection of children rests with the parents or guardians. The parent has the right and the duty to care for his children and to protect them from abuse and neglect".

The article goes on to point out that sometimes parents cannot, or do not, fulfill this responsibility, and it becomes necessary for an agency to give protective service. "It is a service", says the article, "initiated on the basis of a complaint because the parent does not wish to or cannot ask for help"....."It follows that an agency responsible for the protection of children from neglect or abuse is responsible for taking over the primary duty of the parent. Protection of children then as a service must therefore not only protect children from neglect and abuse but wherever possible must help parents with the problem of their responsibility for rearing their children".

This service consists of not only protecting children from neglect and abuse, but wherever possible it seeks to help parents in their responsibility for rearing their children, where it is evident such help is required.

Our local society believes it is better to help such parents than to remove the children from their care and make them a responsibility of the public. In January last, the society reported dealing with 33 cases of neglect, involving 80 children and 74 cases under the Children of Unmarried Parents Act. Out of the 154 children, only two were committed by the courts as wards.

But all families do not respond to even the most understanding help of the society. Through the years some

children do have to be committed as wards. As of the end of January, the Sarnia and Lambton County society had 172 wards and 84 non-wards in care.

For these children, the society has the responsibility of finding other homes. Sometimes these homes are free. Sometimes they are boarding homes. Sometimes they are adoption homes. The free and adoption homes are not a charge on public funds. The society had 139 children in such homes. 98 children are in boarding homes and the remainder are in institutions or other types of care.

To our Children's Aid Society, each of these figures represents a child. It strives to give each child a feeling of being wanted and of having a foster family who cares. Is this not better than leaving him with permanent scars which may affect his whole after life? I sometimes marvel that our Children's Aid Societies have been able to find staff members capable of making the detailed study of both child and foster home that seems to me to be necessary in such adjustments of human beings.

In the province as a whole, last year there were approximately 40,000 children under protection care; roughly 12,000 who had to be removed from their parents and cared for and 3,000 children of unmarried parents for which the local societies assumed responsibility. Of these, less than 9,000 had to be maintained at public expense.

All the services that must be rendered in these 55,000 cases cost money. While the actual number of children who have to be maintained at public expense represent considerably less than one-quarter of the total number of children protected by the societies, there is still the expense of employing social service workers and maintaining offices.

To ease the burden, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) last year persuaded the government to contribute 25 per cent of the amount of money raised from private campaigns for funds and also 25 per cent of the cost of caring for wards. Such assistance will help the Children's Aid Societies to continue and expand the good work which they are now doing.

I sometimes wonder if our municipal officials and our people as a whole fully realize the work being carried on by these societies. We are tempted to divide the number of children under pay care into the dollars spent and on that basis claim expense is exorbitant, when it should be shown that some 75 per cent more children, who are not under pay care, are receiving service. While I do not have exact figures for last year, the figures for the year ending March 31st, 1948, show the average cost of giving service and care to an individual child across the province was around $85.00.

In view of these remarks, I believe it is our responsibility, individually and collectively, to support these societies to the utmost. In so doing, we will be making sure that their authority is retained on the local basis, free from any political interference, and thus they will be able to accomplish the greatest amount of good for the many thousands of children who come under their jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the years this grand old province has made a great contribution to our way of life in this Dominion. Our people have always been blessed with great opportunities and, because of the freedom that has been preserved under past and present governments, we have made great progress. Our present government has given real

leadership and, on a number of occasions, has introduced legislation which our Federal government has seen fit to model. So long as we continue to have this kind of government, a government that confines itself to seeing that the rules of the game of life are fairly applied and kept, a government that continues to regulate in the general interest of the people, and at the same time avoids crippling intervention in the affairs of the citizens, but at the same time always able and willing to take up the slack when adverse circumstances arise, I am sure we will have continued growth and expansion in the future.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Take G follows)

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to take the opportunity of congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on the high degree of efficiency you have brought to this House. Apart from coming from the wrong side of Windsor, we are very happy to know you are carrying on your office in such a fine way.

I would also like to take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger). While he is not in his seat, I am still going to say that, on his elevation to that portfolio.

SOME hon.members would say he has gone from the brew into the view because under that department the matter of housing is of paramount importance. I feel quite confident that the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) has a great opportunity to render a great public service in his present office to the people of Ontario who are desperately in need of housing, and who are hopeful that he will assume his responsibilities in that regard and bring about a happy situation.

And now, Mr. Speaker, while I am speaking of the Department of Planning and Development, the thought has occurred to me that the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) also has a great opportunity in respect to a local problem in our constituency. I refer to the talk of the development of an international airport in the city of Windsor. At this particular time, many people are greatly concerned about these talks this government is having with the government at Ottawa, with a view to having an international airport at the west end of the city of Windsor. A lot of people are concerned about it. Many of

them feel this airport is not in the best interests of Windsor and Windsor, people, and I am inclined to agree with them, and somewhere along the line there should be some thought given both to the promoters and the people who are opposing this development. The thought has occurred to me that if the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) were to use the facilities of his department and make a complete and thorough study of this international airport in relation to how it will affect the growth of Sandwich West and Windsor, generally, and then make his findings available to the people down there, I am sure that that service would be highly appreciated by the people of Windsor.

During the course of this debate I have heard much in this House that I agree with, and I have heard much that I do not agree with. However, I would like to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds) who suggested during the course of his contribution, that he felt every effort should be made to go ahe d with the development of power sites on the St. Lawrence River, and I would go further than the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Reynolds), I would say, by all means go ahead, let us have the development of the power site on the St. Lawrence River, and let us also have the development of the St. Lawrence deep water way. Much good would be done by the development of this waterway, both to the city of Windsor and to the province of Ontario, and while it is an international project, I am sure that Ontario could make itself heard in respect of this very essential development.

And now, I am not going to pass any more compliments out, because from now on what compliments I have left, I am going to say them to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett)

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) upon his announced intention of building a new dual highway from Windsor to Toronto. The need for this highway is great and with all due respect to the opinion of the hon. Member from Niagara Falls, (Mr. Houck) the fact remains that one third of the total tourist traffic that enters the Province of Ontario enters by the port of Windsor. I would also point out that the need for this highway is not only urgent but one that is long overdue, as our existing highway structures leading from the City of Windsor are far from adequate and cannot begin to carry the tremendous volume of traffic they are called upon to carry in the summer months.

Particularly is the need great from Windsor to London and I would suggest that every effort be made by the department of Highways to start the construction of this new Highway as early as humanly possible and that the construction should start from the Windsor end first.

The more tourists that visit our Province the greater the revenue received from gasoline taxes, and that is probably true in respect to liquor profits as we were told time and again last year.

However, the fact remains, highways that attract tourists are self liquidating assets and certainly the new Windsor highway will attract thousands of new visitors upon its completion because of the geographical location of Windsor. Every day it is delayed this province is suffering a loss of new revenue and much of the work done by the department of Travel and Publicity is wasted.

In my Throne Speech last March, and on numerous occasions

since, I pointed out the dangerous condition of two bridges on Highway 39. One over the Puce River at Puce and the other over Little River in Sandwich East township. Both these bridges are single lane bridges and have needlessly claimed many lives. Surely we can look forward to the replacing of both these bridges this year and the Highway generally brought up to a standard comparable to other Highways carrying a much smaller volume of traffic.

I would point out to the hon Minister (Mr. Doucett) the replies given by his department on Friday last, March 3rd, in "Votes and Proceedings" in answer to a series of questions I put on the Order Paper in respect to this. There he will see that Highway 39 shows a 60.9 percent, increase in traffic during the past three years, a percentage increase unsurpassed by any other Highway in the Province, while expenditures on upkeep and improvement are well below those of much less important highway.

Last week in his Throne Speech the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) eloquently and forcefully dealt with the issue of Municipal Provincial relations and in doing so he has introduced on the floor of this House an issue of paramount importance both to Government on the Municipal level and the Municipalities in general.

While we have heard much about the good relations that exist between the Department of Municipal Affairs and our Municipalities, and I certainly have only the highest praise for the hon Minister (Mr. Dunbar) and his department as they are most co-operative and helpful, however, let me suggest to this Government that they should not gloss over these happy relations and try to "kid" themselves that a good job has been done by our Municipalities and

then proceed to juggle grants from day to day to such an extent that our Municipal Governments find themselves "standing on their heads" in a daze trying to figure out just where it is all going to end.

Yes, the time has arrived when this merry-go-round relationship between this Government and that of the Municipalities must be called to a halt and a proper appraisal made and a definite line of demarkation drawn as to where responsibility begins and ends. I suggest that the time is most opportune for a complete revision and overhauling of Municipal-Provincial relations and that this should take place previous to any further Federal-Provincial talks, as many of the decisions to be arrived at at the forthcoming Ottawa Conference will seriously affect our Municipal Governments.

I will go further and state that the whole basis of present-day Municipal taxation is wrong. We have arrived at the stage in Municipal Government where a large percentage of all Municipal expenditures are uncontrollable, yet the field of taxation is definitely limited.

During the discussion in this House on the Government Housing Bill we heard much about the desirability of encouraging home ownership. Certainly we in Municipal Governments have no greater desire than to look forward to the day when 100 percent of our people are home owners with the resultant high degree of community spirit and citizenship that follows, but this cannot happen if we are to go on perpetuating a condition whereby the field of Municipal taxation is confined to its present narrow limites while the ever increasing costs of education, social services and other uncontrollable expenditures have no limits.

Let us look at this problem from the standpoint of the average citizen who earns an average wage. For the sake of argument we shall say that this average citizen lives in the City of Windsor where the distribution of the Municipal tax dollar is much the same as that of the majority of our larger Municipalities. Mr. Average citizen has a small family, is a good law-abiding citizen and wants nothing better than the right to provide for and raise his children in decency. His first problem is to provide a permanent roof over the heads of his family and as the desire for home ownership and some form of family security is strong he finally decides to build a home. Now a home to our average citizen is not wealth. It is an economic necessity. As time goes on Mr. Average Citizen finds it tough to meet his payments on the home; keep it in a fair state of repair and pay the taxes, especially when they keep going up, so let's have a look and determine exactly how these Municipal taxes are made up.

Out of a total mill rate of 45 mills, approximately 20 mills go for such necessary services as:

Police protection
Fire protection
Library facilities
Street and sidewalk maintenance
Garbage pickup and incineration
Public health services,
Parks, playgrounds and organized recreation
Administration

All of which are necessary services and a just charge against property -- or the home, as we know it.

Next to that comes seven mills for debt service and debenture retirement. While this is out of line with the average in Ontario, perhaps at this time it would be interesting to know why this generation of Windsor taxpayers are paying so heavily on debt. Much of this explanation can be dismissed

by merely saying that in the twenties the government of Windsor was in the hands of the real estate element, but aside from that an article I clipped from the Windsor Star of last week tells a very large part of the story:

"Windsor welfare costs had dropped $473,252.11 since 1936".

Now, while I do not intend to deal with the matter of Welfare, this particular time, that has very much to do with the heavy debt of the city of Windsor.

(Page G-8 follows)

However, aside from debt charges, this is the percentage of the tax dollar through which your council and my council can control their expenditures. Including debt charges it works out that approximately 60 per cent of Municipal expenditures are controllable by council. All these expenditures and services can rightly be classified as a proper charge against the home-owner, and if this government and that at Ottawa were to assume their just responsibility Municipal taxation against the home would stop here, and the Municipalities would require no grants -- in lieu of this and in lieu of that.

Just for a moment I would like to give you an idea of just what it has cost my municipality and many others who had to secure housing for their homeless while this government turned a deaf ear. We have had to subsidize a Federal government agency to the tune of over $62,000.00 a year in order to get housing. I can only say that we are looking forward to the new Ontario Housing Act with a soul full of hope and trust that we do not end up with a soul full of soap.

Now to get down to the remaining 18 mills, or approximately 40 per cent of our Municipal budget that is uncontrollable and an unjust charge against the home-owner, and in the great majority of cases represents the differences between the people in our communities being predominately home-owners or tenants.

In this category comes education, which in the case of Windsor accounts for approximately 14 mills. Yes, the Tories promised they would take over 50 per cent of the cost of education in our town, too, but last year these grants amounted to 23 per cent, and every year it is being whittled

down and down. I am now informed that the new educational grants, announced since the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has had a look-see at the Hope Report, have shaved off over $30,000 from vocational schools, so be it "Hope" or "hopeless" we are taking a hosing.

I notice the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Murdoch) is not in his seat. I can well remember last year he took a great interest in the cause of education. In fact, I am going to go further than that, I am going to suggest to the government that if it is true they are looking for a Minister of Education, I can highly remember the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Murdoch).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ELLIS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to read into the record the percentage of grants to expenditures for the city of Windsor:

"In 1943, they were 5 per cent.

In 1944, they were 5 per cent.

In 1945, they were 30 per cent.

In 1946, they were 30 per cent.

In 1947, they were 24 per cent.

In 1948, they were 26 per cent.

In 1949, they were 23 per cent."

As I said before, we understand they have knocked off another $30,000. so they come down this year to 22 per cent or 21 per cent.

But seriously speaking, education should not be a charge against property, or the home, as we know it. Education is something that our young people should have to the extent of their ability to assimilate it, irrespective of the ability of their parents to pay municipal taxes. If Canada is to become the great country of equal opportunity for all

that it should, then our young people must be equipped with the best of educational opportunities whether they come from the homes of the poor or the homes of the rich. Education is a just charge against the wealth of the nation, and not the necessities of life.

The next mill is assessed for the cost of administration of justice and under this heading a lot of sins are committed, in more ways than one, but the biggest sin of them all is that the little fellow who is trying to buy and own a home should have to pay the shot.

Finally, but not least, we come to the classification known as Social Services, which to date, accounts for a little over three mills, but tomorrow may be the straw that broaks the home-owner's back. They comprise child care or Children's Aid Societies, direct relief, supplementary relief, industrial schools and hospitalization, net or less grants. Now, I think it is pretty well established by authorities who have made a study of it that these costs can only go one way and that is up.

Many hon. members during the course of this debate have forcefully and strongly pointed out the seriousness of the unemployment situation as it exists today, both to the individual, the family, the province and the nation. Well, we remember the hungry thirties, and well we remember the callous and complacent attitude of senior governments of those days. The onus of responsibility to feed, clothe and shelter the victims of unemployment was thrown onto the municipalities -- and it broke them, and in some of our cities today we are still paying in taxes levied against our homes for the buck-passing and sheer stupidity of government both here and at Ottawa.

Yes, and quite recently when all our industrial plants in Windsor were closed down because of a gas shortage and tens of thousands of workers thrown out of work, we appealed to Queens Park for help to stave off the spectre of hunger that faced the families of these workers, and what did we get -- nothing! The same callous, complacent attitude was evident.

The responsibility to feed, clothe, shelter, supply medical care and hospitalization for the sick, the maimed, the neglected and the unemployed is definitely not that of the home-owner. Surely we would not suggest that the cost of pensions for the aged and blind are a just charge against the home-owner, as such, in this day and age.

Yes, it is time we had a re-appraisal of our respective fields of responsibility -- let us quit buck-passing and glib talk about encouraging home-ownership and then refusing to face the elements that destroy it. Let us get down to earth and let all three levels of government assume their just responsibilities, and let us for once and all quit the process of juggling grants from year to year and trying to destroy local autonomy.

Surely the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) has the courage and the desire to convene a Municipal-Provincial conference and work out with the municipalities a proper and just division of responsibility. Once unanimity has been established on this level, then he could proceed to Ottawa in a spirit of co-operation and determination to finish the job in the best interests of the municipalities, the province and of Canada as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments to deal with the matter of agriculture. After all, I do represent

in part an agricultural riding.

We are informed in the Throne Speech that the Department of Agriculture is doing everything within its power to co-operate with the federal government to maintain and improve agricultural conditions. This is as it should be, and especially in times such as these, when we are reminded at every turn of declining farm prices.

MR. DUNBAR: I thought that was all subsidized.

MR. ELLIS: Perhaps a little subsidizing. You have the municipalities, anyway, George. (Mr. Dunbar)

No one is more conscious of the need to maintain farm prices than the workers in industry who well remember that in the early 30's with every decline in farm income there was a corresponding decline in employment in our industrial plants; if we are to continue to enjoy full employment in our industrial plants, farm income must be kept at a level that will permit our farmers to buy the products of our factories.

With this in mind I would like to point out to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy), while he is not here, I hope he reads Hansard --that on November the 3rd, 1949, there was 362,351 bushels of American corn in store at elevators throughout eastern Canada, but five weeks later on December 8th, 1949, these stocks of American corn in storage in the same elevators had increased to 4,160,750 bushels. This huge influx of corn from the United States holds particular significance for producers of Ontario corn, and is in direct competition to the marketing of our local crop and especially does it affect the counties of Essex and Kent, where the bulk of the Canadian corn crop is grown.

I quote from the Windsor Daily Star of December 13, 1949, reporting the December meetinf of the Kent Federation of Agriculture:

> "A request from the Federation that the government restrict the amount of United States corn entering Canada, when ample home-grown product is on hand, met little enthusiasm at Ottawa."

The same degree of enthusiasm, I suppose, as the unemployed met when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said he was sorry for them.

> "Letters from Rt. Hon. C.D.Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, and Hon. Douglas Abbott, Minister of Finance, indicated that the government did not consider the idea feasible!"

Here is an example where co-operation on the federal-provincial level is sadly lacking and the corn growers of Essex and Kent will suffer unfair competition unless immediate steps are taken to protect them against the dumping of American corn in direct competition to the local crop.

Briefly, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) a few of the facts relative to the marketing of the Essex corn crop, and I would refer the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) to the "Economic Annalyst" of December, 1949;

> "Seasonal variation in price. The index of seasonal variation in the Canadian farm price of corn, 1935-39, was at its peak between July and September, preceding the new harvest, and at its lowest point in October and November, when the bulk of marketed corn was high in moisture.

"More than 40 percent. of the corn marketed in October and November contained more than 25 percent. moisture. Since about 24 percent. of all corn that was sold was marketed at these low prices, this represents a considerable loss to Canadian producers. Only about 3 percent. of the selling was done between July and September, when the price was relatively high and practically all of the corn contained less than 17.5 percent. of moisture.

"In the six months, January to June, between these two periods of extreme price variation, the index changed only 11 points. In this period of relatively stable prices, farmers marketed about 55 percent. of all corn sold."

Corn, in the majority of cases, is a cash crop to the growers and that accounts for the bulk of the crop being marketed during the October-November period, and at a time when the moisture content is high, which not only results in lower prices to the producers, but has also resulted in loss of markets also. In this connection, an article which appeared in the Comber Herald of February 23rd, 1950, is interesting:

"An Open Letter to Essex Corn Growers. Sir: Having grown corn in the County of Essex for 57 years, I have followed the three stages necessary to produce and harvest and market Essex corn -- "

I am going to leave that part out, it is not very interesting.

AN hon. MEMBER: Read it all.

MR. ELLIS: "And now the third phase, the most important one. I am sorry I cannot report one item of progress in the whole marketing effort in the past 57 years in growing corn in the County of Essex. We are selling more water and paying freight on it the past two years than ever before. We sell our corn on a wet basis and are paid for it on a dry basis. Today, corn is selling for $1,30 per bushel for 14 per cent moisture. As the average moisture content for all but kiln dried corn that base left Essex is about 24 per cent or 10 per cent water or a deduction of 2½ cents per point of moisture or a deduction of 25 cents per bushel. Corn that is wet is thrown into the hands of a grain broker who sets the value of that corn.

The corn having 10 per cent moisture and worth $1.30 per bushel, shrinks or dries out 10 per cent which is 13 cents, leaving the broker 12 cents per bushel for drying our corn, a job that the farmers ought to do themselves in September and October; and so fill and develop the best market we have. Our brother farmers in Northern Ontario from North Bay to James Bay and across the great Clay Belt, where fine large dairy herds have been developing for the last 40 uears, there is a market for all the corn that Essex can produce. These farmers want their feed bins filled by the 1st of November. You do not find them hauling home feed in a 40 below blizzard. When they want our corn, we have not got it picked or if we have, we cannot fill their market for our corn is not in a condition to ship direct to any consumer.

and so that vast dormant market for Essex corn is being filled by western oats and barley.

Brother co-operators, let us pool our interests and tell our brother farmers in Northern Ontario that next crop year we will be able to ship them direct by the first of November, from five hundred to a thousand cars of Essex Kiln dried corn and also tell them at present market price they can get eight pounds more and better feed in a bushel of corn at the same price as a bushel of barley. Let us show as big a progress in marketing our corn in the next few years as we have made in the production and harvesting. Build dryers to handle our next year's corn crop."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): That is a lot of corn.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

(Take H-1 follows)

MR. DUNBAR: Is that popcorn?

MR. ELLIS: While there are those who maintain that the marketing problem of the corn growers can only be solved through the construction of more elevators, nevertheless, from the recent experience of dumpting of American corn on the Canadian market, as I pointed out in my earlier remarks, more elevators might mean more American corn. I am inclined to agree with Mr. J. T. Arnew when he suggests that more dryers will bring about orderly marketing of the crop with a greater return to the growers.

I also agree with Mr. J. T. Arnew that these dryers should be operated in conjunction with the Growers Co-operatives, so that in the final analysis the growers will receive the maximum benefit.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex South): Question. May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker, of the hon. member (Mr. Ellis)? I wonder does the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Ellis) realize that this corn business is strictly a federal issue, that the grades are made by the federal government and importation of corn by the federal government and that the co-member, as it were, the hon. Paul Martin is looking after all these things in Ottawa?

MR. ELLIS: Mr. Speaker, that is quite true, but I would point out that we have been told during the course of this Session that there has been a great deal of co-operation between the federal and provincial Departments of Agriculture, and the fact remains we have this tremendous dumpting of American corn on the Canadian market, and while that is controlled by those in authority at Ottawa, the fact remains that somebody has got to speak for the corn growner, and if

hon. Paul Martin is not capable of doing that job, then I suggest to the provincial Department of Agriculture that they should intercede, and I think that is a reasonable suggestion to make.

Now, so far as the marketing of the corn crop is concerned, definitely the Department of Agriculture has much to do with that. That is why I would suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) that his Department not only intercede with the federal government in respect to the dumping of the American corn but also give every assistance to the Essex farmer co-operatives in bringing about adequate dryer facilities to assist the growers in more orderly and profitable marketing of their crops.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. H. W. WALKER (Welland) Mr. Speaker, in rising to add my remarks to the debate,

(Page H-3 follows

and being an Optimist, I have a warm feeling for part of the programme placed before this Assembly by the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) and his government.

While not agreeing wholly in principle of the pessimistic outlook of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), I feel there is merit to the debate in some cases for the betterment of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to me the need for more than just debate to a government policy and always referring to the people as labour. Labour to me has been those people that are interested in the future of their community and country labour, regardless of their status in life, whether manual or professional or their colour or creed.

The outcome of the government election in Britain just a few short days ago indicates what I have to say regarding labour; the people of the British Empire have always fought for what was right.

They have changed from one government to another and now they are changing or will shortly, to another by the indication at this present time.

They have always believed in the principal of democratic rights of freedom of speech. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, a good government policy, in my opinion, is the three way partnership, co-operation by labour, management and government.

Mr. Speaker, may I add my regards with the hon. members of the Assembly to the mover and seconder to the Speech from the Throne. Also in hoping for a speedy recovery for the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell) and for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Kelley). The work in the Department of Health, I am sure, must have taken a great toll

of his health.

The Dominion and Provincial conference within the months that lie ahead, with co-ordination and co-operation of the Dominion and Province of Ontario, that now seems to be working to a satisfactory measure, will no doubt bring to the people of Ontario:

(1) The lowering of the old age pension from 70 to 65.

(2) No means test.

(3) A complete Hospitalization Plan, contributory by -- employer, employee, and government. This I feel sure can be brought into being by the co-ordination of the Dominion and Provincial Governments.

(4) The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) has given the Assembly some outline of the costs of hospitals and additions. There will have to be continued additions to make health what it should be in Ontario.

The homes of the aged people and children's shelters will have to be reconsidered and I believe no greater public works programme could be complete without the remodelling, and in some cases rebuilding, decent up-to-date buildings with plenty of light and modern conveniences.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed sorry that the brief that was presented by the Nursing Profession on September 29th, 1947, to the Department of Health was not considered in the past year. It does not give the public the attitude that the Health Department and the Nursing Profession are working in the best interests of one another. I do hope that the Department of Health will reconsider this proposal.

All the cities within the province pay 66-2/3

per cent of the cost per population and the province pays the balance, namely 33-1/3 per cent. All other municipalities pay 50 per cent and the province 50 per cent. Health is for everyone and it would seem fairer if it were more equal.

I feel this government is long past due in the need for consideration to the incapacitated persons. In the past year all the requests on welfare in my constituency were handled with the greatest of consideration and courtesy by the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) and his Department. The only cases that are not complete are the incapacitated ones and the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) and his Department have no authority under the Act, therefore his Department receives criticism where it is not justified. These cases should be under the Pension system, therefore strengthening the chain of the Health and Welfare Department.

Mr. Speaker, it is well to note the belated progress in the Ontario Hydro System.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, the local Hydro Commissions could stand a change in the Hydro system.

I believe the Notorious 13th Bill should be revised and that there be charged to the operations account before declaration of surplus the cost of: street lighting, Parks, Community Halls, and the flood-lighting of playing fields.

Mr. Speaker, if I may enlarge on this suggested change. It seems to me that the 13th Bill for rebate or added assessment, does not work in harmony between Ontario Hydro and Local Municipal Hydro Commissions.

Toronto Hydro fiscal year, ending some two months before local Hydro bodies, therefore assessing them more money than has already been billed to the consumer.

The declared surplus that is created locally after

allowing budgeting for future expansion or emergencies.

The above mentioned Publicly owned necessities such as street lights, parks, community halls and playing fields.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to declare a surplus on street lighting alone and the local lighting system is never up to local requirements for efficient lighting.

The arena or community halls, by charging lighting costs to local Hydro operation account before declared surplus, would enable local bodies approved to operate community centres more economically and to give more consideration to local youth.

Mr. Speaker, this would mean alone to my local arena approximately $3500.00. A sum that could be converted to the arena where it was collected. Remembering at all times the Hydro slogan-- Hydro at Cost.

All these local projects that I have mentioned if considered would in return not only in juvenile delinquency but in our health programme be a saving to some great extent. I do not believe in all municipalities the declared surplus sufficient to cover all Public services I have mentioned, but would cover a great amount and in some cases all.

From 1913 Welland's Hydro Electric System total assets were $73,933.00 to the present time -- close to the $2,000,000.00 mark. That shows good administration by local bodies. The same administration will show all over the province by local commissions. The request by O.M.E.A. demanding two additional members of the Ontario Hydro board seems a good suggestion. The one representing them at the present time in their opinion is unsatisfactory. That there should be a five-man board the O.M.E.A. shows their ability to handle Hydro locally. Surely, Mr. Speaker, they will be an asset not a liability to the Ontario Hydro System.

The O.M.E.A. are a select body of people elected by the people for thebest interests of the people. They feel Hydro is not living up to its bargain when some years ago $1.00 per horse power was charged to all municipalities for a fund to establish rates on a level basis. This fund is well over some thirty million dollars and was not taken into consideration at the last recent increase in the power rates.

In my opinion it is not fair to clean out all the funds to Hydro Expansion programme. They should be used as intended and the expansion programme should be debentured for the same local improvements are debentured for.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel any criticism can be given to the Department of Highways, the programme outlined by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) recently and surveying the geographical position outlined in the large expenditures suggested, I feel considerable thought has been given to the best advantage for the future of the province.

The people of the Niagara Peninsula, I am sure, will agree with me that the bottleneck at Burlington Bay will be eliminated in the near future. Indeed it calls for a well done Department of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Lands and Forests seems well in the headlines of debate.

I feel the Department of Lands and Forests is a Department we should all co-operate with to the fullest. Its future for continued supply of pulp, tourist attraction, and fishing, and above all its contribution to the water sheds of this province.

I feel a great contribution to this province in co-operation between Lands and Forests Department and local communities in a reforestration measure would not only enlighten the people as to the development work in this field,

but give our youth and interested people a part to play in it.

It is true some municipalities in Ontario have already begun their part in reforestration.

This I feel sure should be somewhat of a compulsory measure. The bush area in the Niagara Peninsula is just about eliminated and very little thought for the future with land in plenty available. May I suggest to the hon. Minister of Reforms (Mr. Hamilton) in his advice and suggestions to the Committee of Welland County Council regarding the County building and Jail that he advises them to build a Jail Farm in the county where some land is available and could be put to some use for the country's future.

(Page H-9 follows)

In the Brief, Mr. Speaker, presented by the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) and development of the study of Holland Marsh is an example of what kind of a province this could be if similar areas were developed.

We have thousands of acres, somewhat of the same in the Niagara area in Humberstone Township, which I hope some day will be considered. The criticism, Mr. Speaker, on publicity in some fields, I believe, is not justified. Good publicity on planning and development travel and recreation areas in Ontario, if done attractively, is progress that I feel, Mr. Speaker, we are all striving for.

The saving of cost on printing in some departments is good administration, the saving on cost in other departments is poor administration. Let us remember we Ontarionians must sell our goods and to sell well is to advertise well.

The publication of "Ontario" by the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile) and other similar volumes is money well spent and a job well done.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, more advertising should be done in our Agricultural Department to bring to the people the importance of the agriculture of this Province and what assistance is available to those that are in the agricultural field. Bring the Junior Farmer closer to the farm and the Department of Agriculture.

On behalf of the people of Welland County we are indebted to the Department of Agriculture for co-operation but the time is here when we should have an assistant agricultural representative to supervise Junior farmers alone and start a project somewhat like Norfolk County and similar counties.

By advertising and good supervision on the part of the Agricultural Department we hope to see our County more agriculturally minded.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the subsidizing to Municipal governments has, or will prove to have been, the wrong method. The subsidy to local policing, fire departments, local improvements, in my opinion should be a direct local responsibility -- costs borne wholly by the local municipality.

The Welfare Department, and the Education Department, in respect to which the Municipal government has not any idea as to actual costs, should be borne by the subsidy in full; direct by the province or Federal governments. If this method or some likewise solution, if not considered, will very soon bankrupt or burden the people to the extent of unsound borrowing power by increased debenture costs or otherwise. The new Housing Act on a three-way partnership basis was, to my mind, very fair and I believe all municipal bodies will agree with it.

The recent revision in education has left the cost difference between rural suburban and city somewhat in an unsatisfactory manner. Credit should be given to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) and his Department for trying to solve, in a fair way, new grants. But it seems to me the people of Ontario, as a whole, are not getting their equal share of the additional grant. The cities, particularly, benefit very little.

For example, a school in my constituency, the J. C. Bald School, has approximately 222 children from the rural area and only approximately 17 children from the city of Welland. Under the new grant, Welland will be penalized for having fewer pupils. On the other hand, if the school was in the

other area, with Welland having the same number and Thorold Township the same number of pupils, the grant to the school would be far greater.

In reference to the thirteen municipalities in the City of Toronto, I am in accord with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

If the local governments cannot agree for the betterment of one another, then the government should decide for the good of all concerned. I believe this opinion of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was sound advice and showed good leadership.

On the other hand, if these municipal bodies were united to the City of Toronto, the education grant would save thousands of dollars, the City of Toronto being the loser. If, on the other hand, the thirteen municipalities held their own municipal bodies separately, they would receive thousands of dollars, the Department of Education being the loser.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe education should be a direct government responsibility. The local mill rate increase today is startling and there seems to be no end to this increase.

In regard to this matter the entire basis of grants seems to be changeable. It would be quite a problem to find out where they stand until the end of the year. However, under this new system the government pays 40 per cent of the debenture charges in the Township and in the City they pay 24 per cent.

If a school becomes part of a city, the provincial grant drops 16 per cent.

Some townships are qualified in population to be a city but they are under the present school grant system very

wise to remain a township. It seems to me the cities of similar size would be advised to change their status from city to township if possible and by changing name only they would benefit greatly financially.

The Department of Labour is reviving the Ontario Labour Code, what it is, we hope, for the best. In fairness I do believe that co-operation has been shown in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) Department.

The amendment to the Compensation Act of last year changing the 66-2/3 to 75 per cent of wages earned by disabled workmen was a measure long needed, but I believe this Act should be put into effect as it was passed in the House one year ago, the waiting period of seven days reduced from seven days to three days before compensation is allowed. The Bill now before the House should be seriously considered and is long past due.

To accomplish this, I feel the structure rating would not be changed a great deal. These increases should normally increase with the cost of living and also decrease if and when the cost of living decreases.

With respect to the request of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and Ontario Mining Industry of removal of Workmen's Compensation Board from the jurisdiction of the Ontario Department of Labour, I say, Mr. Speaker, this is far from the right course. Labour and the Labour Department, I feel, are well able to mind their own affairs, and the legal department be called on when necessary.

The submission by the Ontario Joint Legislative Committee of the Railway Transportation Brotherhoods to the honourable Mr. Justice W. D. Roach, Commissioner re the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Act, has a great deal of food for thought, and should be carefully studied by all concerned.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate on the behalf of Mr. Dempsey (Renfrew South).

Motion agreed to.

Hon. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington North):Would the hon. leader (Mr. Doucett) indicate what Bills will be up tomorrow?

MR. DOUCETT: Yes, we will get on with the Labour Bill tomorrow and the Marriage Act and I think --

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Stop there.

MR. DOUCETT: -- and I think Bill 78.

MR. McEWING: 73?

MR. DOUCETT: 78, 80 and 81 -- in any case, the three Bills announced yesterday. And further government business, and we hope to do a couple of speeches after that.

MR. McEWING: Thank you.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:02 o'clock p.m.

- - - -

A-1

Volume 15.

P R O C E E D I N G S .

of the

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ASSEMBLED THIS EIGHTH DAY OF MARCH, A. D., ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY, AT THREE O'CLOCK, P. M.

/ / / / / / /
- - - - - - -

Toronto, Ontario
Wednesday, March 8, 1950
2.00 o'clock, p. m.

/ / / / / / /
- - - - - - -

3.00 O'CLOCK P.M.

And the House having met.

PRAYERS.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

MR. J. M. PARRY (Kent West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the second and final report of the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Parry, from the Standing Committee on Standing Orders presentsthe following report:

Your Standing Committee on Standing Orders begs leave to present the following as the Committee's second and final report:-

Your Committee has carefully considered the following Petitions and finds the Notices in each case sufficient:-

Petition of the Corporation of the city of Kingston, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the establishment, development and management of the Kingston Community Memorial Health and Recreation Centre.

Petition of the Corporation of the town of Alexandria, praying that an Act may pass to ratify and confirm the purchase by the Corp ration of the Glengarry Mills properties and water rights and the sale of the mill property not required for the Corporation's purposes and to authorize the use and diversion of waters of the River Garry and Loch Garry for the purposes of the town's waterworks and water supply in lieu of the use thereof for mill power purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the city of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass amending the city of Ottawa Act, 1949, for the purpose of detaching all the lands in the township of Nepean from the Registry Division of the county of Carleton and attaching them to the Registry Division of the

city of Ottawa for the purposes of the Registry Act, and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corproation of the city of London, praying that an Act may pass confirming certain agreements between the corporation, and the Canadian National Railway and the Western Fair Association; and for other purposes.

Petition of the Trustees of the United Church of Canada, the Trustee Board of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Corporation of Knox College and the Corporation of Victoria University, praying that an Act may pass confirming a certain agreement vesting the Knox College Library in Knox College and certain archives in Victoria University.

Your Committee has carefully examined the following Petitions and recommends to the House, that while the publication of the Notices has not met the requirements of the Rules, the Petitions should be accepted by the House, a satisfactory explanation for the default having been given:-

Petition of the Corporation of the city of Sault Ste. Marie.

Petition of the Ottawa Separate School Board.

Your Committee further recommends that the following Petition be not accepted, Rule No. 66 not having been complied with and no sufficient explanation for the default having been given.

Your Committee further recommends that the fees less any penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted with respect to the Petition.

Petition of the Corporation of the township of East York.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) George W. Parry
Chairman

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

THE AUDIT ACT

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "The Audit Act, 1950", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, is this an important revision of the Audit Act?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this is a revision of the Audit Act which it transpired, after the last session of the Legislature, had not been revised in forty-two years, and it was felt there were some differences in practice over that time. The Hon. members will recollect the Public Accounts Committee made recommendations which I think the Provincial Auditor has already put into effect, as I notice in this year's public accounts there were many changes in the form of public accounts from previous years. They are all included in the new Act.

THE CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

MR. G. I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Isley, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE STATUTE LABOUR ACT

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Statute Labour Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) give us an explanation.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, this makes about three changes, one of them very slight. The main change in this Act is to permit the commissioner to collect from non-property owners one day's statute labour; in other words, giving them the same power as to corporate municipalities, which has always been in the Act.

It also, Mr. Speaker, changes the computation and commitment to the higher rate.

CITY OF OTTAWA SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARD

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Calder, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa Separate School Board", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Calder, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Ottawa", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, 1949", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill makes two further amendments to the Land and Trust Corporations Act. The first is to enable a corporation, incorporated for the purpose of loaning money on the security of real estate, or carrying on the business of buying and selling land, but which no longer carries on business as such, to amend the letters patent by deletion of those powers. So it will be covered by the ordinary provisions of the Companies' Act and no longer by the provisions of the Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Secondly, it is also provided that all trust companies carrying on business in Ontario, establish and operate common trust funds. A "common trust fund" is one in which monies belonging to a number of estates and trust companies are combined for the purpose of investment, thus affording a method under which the monies of a number of small a medium-sized states and trusts are combined for the purpose of receiving greater safety of principal and stability of income through the resulting diversification of risks and reduction in administration costs.

THE CITY OF LONDON

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Allen, that leave be given to

introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the city of London", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1949," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill involves a number of relatively small changes which have resulted from the experience gained by the Superannuation Commission, during this year's administration of the Act, which was passed last Session.

All these changes are proposed as a result of the recommendations of the Superannuation Commission. Unless some hon. members wish me to do so, I do not think it is necessary to go over all of the minor changes at the present time.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Nothing in it from the Hope Commission?

MR. PORTER: I said the Superannuation Commission.

MR. NIXON: But I said the "Hope Commission".

MR. PORTER: I said this only had to do with the Superannuation Commission.

MR. NIXON: You did not use the word "only".

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): He is absolutely "hopeless" today.

THE ATHLETICS CONTROL ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker,

I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Ath Athletics Control Act, 1947," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) please explain the Bill?

MR. PORTER: This contains a small number of amendments to the Athletics Control Act.

The first is the section which deals with investigation by the Athletics Commissioner, and it is re-enacted in greater detail, and under the present section, no monies

(page A-9 follows)

can be impounded until the minister makes an order. I understand, in the case of some of these contests, the contestants get their hands on the purse, and very often they are out of the country before the minister makes the order. Since this matter is now under the direction of the Minister of Education, perhaps the order is not made as promptly as it would be under the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). We are not as conscious of the financial aspects of these matters, as my hon. colleague (Mr. Frost) was. So it is proposed by this new section to provide a procedure for impounding the money.

Secondly, a provision is made to enable the Athletic Commissioner to be represented when boxing and wrestling shows are held on the same night in different places. It is designed to assure the appointment of officials of the highest calibre.

Power is given to the Minister, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, to make recommendations on the specific matters mentioned.

BUSINESS RECORDS PRODUCTION ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to repeal the Business Records Production Act, 1947", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill refers to the Business Records Production Act which was passed really to deal with a certain specific situation which arose at that time, when an attempt was made by the United States authorities to seize certain papers belonging to some certain

Canadian companies. That situation has now come to an end, and it has been found that, as a result of this Act, there have been some difficulties in carrying on some of the ordinary business transactions across the border, especially where Canadian companies wished to be registered under some of the securities legislation in the United States.

THE TOWN OF LEAMINGTON

MR. WM. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Elgin) that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the town of Leamington", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE TOWN OF ALEXANDRIA

MR. O. F. VILLENEUVE (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. White, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the town of Alexandria", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

PROVINCIAL CORPORATIONS ACT

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Hamilton, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Provincial Corporations Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. H. L. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister (Mr. Welsh) kindly give an explanation of the Bill.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, this Bill eliminates the necessity of duplicate registration.

The second section deals with the filing of annual reports, to bring them into line with the uniform practice of the department.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Hamilton, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1947" and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to rectify some of the injustices we have discovered in the past two years in the operation of this Act. There are cases where it has worked unfairly to those entitled to compensation under the Act, and in other cases, the fund is not receiving fair treatment.

THE COMPANIES ACT

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Hamilton, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Companies Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, the first section of this Bill is to delete subsection two of the present Act, as it no longer serves any purpose.

The second section is to bring certain insurance corporations in line with the Act, as regards the powers of investment.

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Goodfellow, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Public Lands Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in 1949, the provisions of this Act applicable to free grant townships were included in order to make the requirements less onerous to settlers. The same provisions are now made applicable to land under the sales townships.

THE PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Goodfellow, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "The Provincial Parks Act, 1950", and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I might say that this is the first general revision of this Act since it was passed in 1913, and many obsolete provisions are deleted, and the Act, as a whole, is brought into line with the present administrative practice of the Department of Lands and Forests. There is no change in principle.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): It is simply tidying up?

MR. SCOTT: Yes.

THE TOWN OF MALTON

MR. A. A. MACKENZIE (York North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Hall, that leave be given to intro-

duce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the town of Malton", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CITY OF KINGSTON

MR. H. A. STEWART (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, and in the absence of Mr. Pringle, seconded by Mr. Cathcart, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Kingston", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

LIBRARY OF KNOX COLLEGE

MR. A. A. MACKENZIE (York North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Downer, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Library of Knox College and certain Archives", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I table answers to questions 50 and 51.

HON. GEO. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to say a few words about the "A.B.C.'s of Traffic Safety", which we have had placed on the desks of each hon. member of the Legislature this afternoon.

We are now entering our fourth year of a continuous safety campaign throughout the province of Ontario, but still,

as you will have noticed, in this resume given attached to the booklet, the traffic accidents are still mounting in the province of Ontario. While we may say that according to the mileage, and the traffic proportionatelty the accidents have decreased, but that is a very grim picture to point out to the mothers and fathers of the children across our province, and we have thought this little book, which we have placed on your desks, will be something in the way of helping to cut down this needless toll.

I am asking all the hon. members in this Chamber who, in the next few weeks will be leaving here and going to their respective homes and communities, if they will lend every possible help in their power to this very worthy cause.

When you think of the fact that accidents are still killing more children than the worst children's diseases, and that one-sixth of all the people killed were children under the age of nine years, we hope that this book will surely do something to help to cut down this great toll. One thousand five hundred and six children have lost their lives since 1937. Last year there were one hundred and twenty seven.

I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my appreciation, as head of the department, for the splendid cooperation and support given by the press, by the radio, by the schools across Ontario, and the many other clubs and organizations. I do hope that this booklet will mean something, and within the next few days we expect to have one hundred and fifty thousand of these booklets published and ready for distribution among the schools of Ontario.

I want to make this appeal, Mr. Speaker, hoping that in a problem of such vital importance to the province -- we will have -- as I know we will -- the wholehearted support of each and every hon. member who is a leader in his community, assisting us, not next month, nor tomorrow, but each and every day throughout the year.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to offer to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) the congratulations of this group for the honour which was bestowed upon him yesterday. We noticed that he was absent from the Chamber, and upon enquiry we have learned that he is now a "doctor of something or other" --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh,oh.

MR. OLIVER: -- and has had a degree conferred upon him by the University of Western Ontario. I think this is a matter in which we can all join in a very wholehearted way, in saying to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that it is very gratifying to all of us to know that a man from Lindsay is going along a very fine route indeed.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is with very great humility indeed, and with a very great sense of unworthiness that I acknowledge what the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) has said, particularly in the Assembly here, which is so familiar with all my very many shortcomings. I may be safe in going to London or some other place and accepting a degree, as the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) said,"of some sort", but when I come here, the

hon. members of this House and those who are connected with the House, know all about me, and I cannot "put across" anything at all.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in the old first war days it used to be said that "decorations came up with the rations". That may be apropos in speaking about persons in public life, but I feel that any honour of that sort is really a distinction to the hon. members of the Legislature. Whether it was conferred on the proper person or not, is not for me to say, but the real purpose is a distinction on the hon. members of the House, feeling that way about it, it will help me in my great sense of unworthiness.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Does this make the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) a Western alumnus?

MR. FROST: In an honorary way, yes.

MR. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, may I assure the House that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is now an alumnus of Western Ontario.

AN hon. MEMBER: Is that good?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 1.

THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ACT, 1948

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order; on third reading of Bill No. 63, "An Act to amend the Housing Development Act, 1948", Mr. Griesinger.

HON. WM. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 63, "An Act to amend the Housing Development Act, 1948".

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) might clear up a point which was raised in the Globe and Mail headline yesterday, as to just what the government means in this connection.

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) to the fact that there were three different approaches to this, right from the Cabinet benches the other day. There was the approach of the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) himself, who stated in quite a prepared speech that the main type of the project of housing under this new legislation would be the assembly of land, and that land would be given to the private builders, and he suggests that one private builder was prepared to go ahead with the building of houses costing $5,800. each, with a down payment of $580.

The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), however, said that there was never any suggestion that, as far as he was concerned, the government proposed to assemble land and give it to private builders, over whom they had no control, and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) also made the statement that he would rather hesitate to give this land to private builders after assembling it; he thought if the government assembled the land, it should go ahead and build.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the government is prepared at this time to give any further clarification, or is it prepared to accept the headlines in the Globe and Mail as a statement of government policy, because the headlines in the Globe and Mail went far beyond anything the hon. minister (Mr. Griesinger) said. It may be that the Globe and Mail is now deciding government policy.

(Take B follows)

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I may say this matter was fully discussed in the House on second reading, and in Committee, and the hon. members opposite had the fullest opportunity to quote to their Heart's content.

Mr. Speaker, after all, the test of this Act is going to be in its administration.

We are talking of very narrow details in administering this Act, and perhaps little might be accomplished. On the other hand, I will assure the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) it is our intention, as far as we are concerned in Ontario, to give this Act the most generous treatment and interpretation.

It might be that some in this House might think perhaps there should be no such thing as a down payment; that it would not be fair. I do not think so. I think we should encourage people to buy their houses, to become owners of their own homes, and I believe it is a great thing for this country.

I think if money has to be lost in housing, it is justified, if you can win out in the end and can encourage people to own their own homes.

As I say, we are partners in this proposition with the Federal government. They are 75 per cent partners, and I know the hon. members of this House and Mr. Speaker will agree that to be successful in this thing we have to call in municipalities as our partners.

I was talking with the Mayor of London yesterday about this Act, and he is anxious to begin and is taking steps so the City will be a partner right away. It will

be up to the administration to do everything possible to help. We are trying to make it possible for everybody to have the advantage of owning their own home.

I can assure the hon. members opposite that our actions and interpretations of the Act will be generous and they will be assisted in getting a house built if possible.

We are looking for co-operation from our municipal authorities in this thing, and I am sure that we will get great co-operation and assistance from the Dominion authorities, who have a great world of experience in these matters.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I would not care to go. The hon. member (Mr. Dennison) might have something to say in months to come and no doubt will a year from now. I hope we will have an answer, a year from now.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): We agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that much depends upon the administration of the Act; that is why we want to know the intentions of the administration.

The difficulty is that when we ask about intentions, so far as the record is concerned, there appears to be one intention from the hon. Federal Minister (Mr. Winters) which is slightly different from that of the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger), and there is a third one from the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) which was clear and eloquent and encouraging. And last, but not least, we have a fifth version of the government's intention from the Globe and Mail.

With this array of expressions of intention, there is no doubt the government has considerable latitude within

which to move.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): It is normal for them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We might now know what the intentions are after all the probing. Now, we are at the third reading, and we can only hope for the best, but we do so without too much optimism.

MR. MacLEOD: You will not be disappointed.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

DESERTED WIVES' AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 65, "An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): I move third reading of Bill No. 65, "An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

THE MINING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 72, "An Act to amend The Mining Act", Mr. Gemmell.

Hon. W. S. GEMMELL (Minister of Mines): I move third reading of Bill No. 72, "An Act to amend The Mining Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE MINING TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 75, "An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act", Mr. Gemmell.

Hon. W. S. GEMMELL (Minister of Mines): I move third reading of Bill No. 75, "An Act to amend The Mining Tax Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the Act.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE HIGH SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 79, "An Act to amend The High Schools Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister od Education): I move third reading of Bill No. 79, "An Act to amend The High Schools Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass, and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like with the permission of the House, to advance toward Committee stage with private Bills, and proceed with second readings. If there is to be any lengthy debate we will hold them out

Order No. 25.

TOWN OF PORT HOPE AND TRINITY COLLEGE SCHOOL

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 25th Order, second reading of Bill No. 1, "An Act respecting the Town of Port Hope and Trinity College School", Mr. Foote.

MR. J. W. FOOTE (Durham): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave

to move second reading of Bill No. 1, "An Act respecting the Town of Port Hope and Trinity College School".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): 26th Order.

CITY OF HAMILTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 26th Order, second reading of Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the City of Hamilton". Mr. Easton.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 2, "An Act respecting the City of Hamilton".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 27.

CITY OF PORT ARTHUR

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 27th Order, second reading of Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur". Mr. Robinson.

MR. G. I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): In the absence of Mr. Robinson, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 6, "An Act respecting the City of Port Arthur".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 28.

CENTRAL CANADA EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 28th Order, second reading of Bill No. 9, "An Act respecting Central Canada Exhibition Association", Mr. Morrow.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Morrow, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 9, "An Act respecting Central Canada Exhibition Association".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 29.

BORDER CITIES YOUNG MEN'S AND YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 29th Order; second reading of Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting Border Cities Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations", Mr. Murdoch.

MR. W. MURDOCH (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting Border Cities Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 30.

MOUNT HAMILTON BRANCH, CANADIAN LEGION AND SALVATION ARMY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 30th Order, second reading of Bill No. 13, "An Act respecting Mount Hamilton Branch, Canadian Legion and Salvation Army". Mr. Thornberry.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 13, "An Act respecting Mount Hamilton Branch, Canadian Legion and Salvation Army".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 40.

GAME AND FISHERIES ACT, 1946

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 40th Order, second reading of Bill No. 84, "An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act, 1946", Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

Hon. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 84, "An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act, 1946".

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, could this Bill be held over? If the Government would allow, I would like to say something on the second reading.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): It is going on to Committee in a separate section, and the hon. member (Mr.Dennison) may speak on it in Committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 39.

LABOUR RELATIONS ACT, 1950.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 39th Order; second reading of Bill No. 82, "The Labour Relations Act, 1950". Mr. Daley.

Hon. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 82, "The Labour Relations Act, 1950".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I should say at the outset of my remarks that consideration, very considerable consideration, was given to the possibility, advisability, or otherwise, of having this Bill go before the Labour Committee. It was decided that this Bill is of such importance, as it affects almost everyone who lives within the boundaries of this Province,in one way or another, that it should be discussed here, and not sent to the Labour Committee where the arguments that I am sure will prevail would be confined to being heard by just a few people.

It is felt that this Bill should be discussed and plenty of opportunity given for discussion of it by the entire House.

It gave me a bit of a shock when I came to

and I say this -- it gave me a bit of a shock when I came to

read these few notes which I brought in with me, and I see the words "free enterprise".

I know the Opposition seem to take some objection when I use that term.

MISS A. MACPHAIL (York East): We cannot find the "enterprise."

MR. DALEY: When I think of the progress of development in this country in my lifetime, and the culture of the people, and the good of industry, you find that this Province, and this country of ours is one of the great unions of the world under free enterprise. And I see no reason for apologizing for the use of that term.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DALEY: Because under this system, this country has a greater opportunity for the people to progress than any other similar area in the world. I repeat again, that a man in this Province has the greatest opportunity. He can be an employee today and an employer tomorrow.

But in this country, as in any other place, we have greed and unreasonableness and selfishness, and we have man's inhumanity to man, and that makes it imperative that we have laws.

If man was perfect, I suppose we would not need any laws. And as men, employee and employer, they must work together in mutual understanding and goodwill, and it is necessary that there must be regulations and laws.

Experience taught the former government, and this government, that the condition of complete goodwill and understanding was wishful thinking, so there must be some rules of the game, and this Labour legislation which I am introducing is just that: the rules of the game.

This is the first Bill this government has had since in power which concerned Ontario solely.

During the war we adopted the regulation of the ederal government, P.C.1003. It was only to regulate war industry. In 1948 we adopted a National Labour Code, because we felt there was a desire expressed on behalf of a part of organized labour that there should be uniformity of legislation, and we thought that if this great industrial province adopted that Code, it would probably add something to the possibility of having uniform legislation.

It did not work out that way, and we now feel that this province should have regulations of its own.

I have now had some six years administering the Department of Labour. In that time, I have seen many weaknesses in legislation, and I have seen some injustices, and some almost insurmountable difficulties in regard to administration. I have endeavoured in this Bill to correct these faults. I have investigaged every avenue and discussed and weighed very carefully the thinking of men who have had great experience in labour relations.

In this Act, no one who at the moment has bargaining rights suffers any loss. Certifications have been perfected. The Labour Relations Act is not a substitute for collective bargaining, which we, as the government, firmly believe in. The Act provides for collective bargaining when employers and employees are unable to reach an agreement, and I think we have a good cohesive Act -- an Act that fits together well from the beginning to end, from the beginning of the meetings for certification, right down through

all the stages of negotiation and conciliation, and in certain cases, arbitration and settlement.

It does not take away from organized labour the right to use their economic strength. It does make the rules which, if followed by employer and employee, and a Judge, which not entirely removing the necessity for a strike or lock-out, should minimize the possibility of these things being necessary.

Labour legislation in this expanding industrial province, with all the ramifications of the numerous groups of organized labour, sometimes endeavouring to raid each other's jurisdiction with over-zealous union officials and with some employees who have not kept in tune with today's thinking, and who would, because of their actions, remain as unfair competition to other employees and employers, not at their own expense, but at the expense of the workers,-- makes labour legislation very difficult.

I believe that legislation should be the minimum rather than the maximum, for in the final analysis and negotiation and discussion between the parties, you will find that is the only way to settle disputes. You can accomplish more by discussion with all members, rather than referring to courts or getting leave to present; it would settle nothing.

You will note in this legislation the absence of any proposed reference to union security. That was intentional on my part. I do not believe it is a matter for legislation.

Organized labour has a job to do itself. If it does it well by organizing the workers and winning the confidence of the workers, and establishes itself by these actions in

the confidence of the employer, then union security will follow just as sure the sun follows rain.

If it fails to win this confidence of management and labour, then it should not expect legislation to give it something it does not merit. The field is theirs, and they should accept the responsibilities that must go hand in hand with power.

I do suggest, however, that where the union has established itself and the majority of the workers indicate their willingness to have their dues checked off by signing voluntarily a card to that effect, there should be little hesitation on the part of management of meet this request.

We give labour the right to follow the union of its own choice, and we protect it from discrimination and unfair practices. Certification by which an employer is to recognize the union is continued with this important change. If it is revealed that a union has between 45 percent. to 55 percent. in a unit as members, the Board must order an arbitration vote to determine the wages of the employee. Where more than 55 percent. belong to the union, the Board may order a vote, and if the union wants the vote, it will be certified. To win the vote, the union must get more than 50 percent.

We have had a lot of difficulty with that, where the margin was so very slim; it was right on the borderline. Unions thought it was unfair, when for some reason some votes they had in their organization might be eliminated because the Board might rule that they were not eligible for that unit. Employers felt where there was a slim margin, it did not express the opinion of the workers.

So, where there is a difference, and 45 percent. of these people desire to have the union bargain for them, and up to 55 percent., then a vote is mandatory, though a representative vote will be taken in these cases. We will let the workers see what they want. This vote will be supervised by the Department.

In continuing the certification procedure, we have dealt with craft units, and we have endeavoured to reach a provision to bargain thoroughly through the union protection in the craft.

We have all the rules and procedures in the Act, and I am sure they will be discussed. I will not go into it a great deal. We have drafted a collective agreement, and no agreement shall be an agreement for the purposes of this Act if it discriminates against any person, race, or creed. You cannot read into a collective agreement discrimination against any person. We have sought by this Act to encourage agreements longer than one year, by voting for a minimum term of one year.

We have endeavoured to spell out the conditions for termination of agreement. Now, this probably will be contentious, but we feel in the interest of the workers and harmony, that where a union obtains certification and has for any of the reasons outlined -- which are spelled out -- failed to hold the confidence of the workers, these workers should be entitled to have that union re-certified and not prevent them from joining any other union.

We think that the workers are entitled to have their protection, and the terms and conditions of termination are spelled out very carefully in the Act.

We are requiring that all literature of both employers and trade unions shall bear the names and addresses of the printers and publishers, if it is to be distributed.

(Page B-14)

We have restored the practice of investigating discrimination or dismissal contrary to the Act through a commission, and the Minister is empowered to make any order he deems necessary to carry out the recommendation of the Commission.

Inthe case of prosecution, consent to pposecute will be by the Board rather than the Minister. Any and all proceedings commenced under the Act of 1948 shall be continued to their conclusion under this Act. All unions certified under the old Act shall be deemed to be certified under this Act.

Where a by-law has been passed by a municipality to bring its employees under the Labor Relations Act, that will be effective and not disturbed or rectified by this legislation.

There are a couple of items in thepresenting of this Act to which we have given further consideration. . I point out section 12. There might be some confusion there and we have designed a new section, which will be submitted as an amendment, to take care of the difficulty that we felt that we had not completely takencare of. That amendment will, we believe, be able to remove the objection that any trade unions might have to that section as it now reads in the Act.

And in the case of section 2 of section 59 and section 60---which is a companion of this Bill---which applied the same terms against employers as against the union,---it is our intention to delete section 2 of section 59 and section 60. So you might note, hon. members, that these items are to be removed from the Bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, any legislation is only good to the extent that it is acceptable and workable and practicable to all concerned, and we have given many months of study to this Bill. Our research has gone back several years. We feel that we have designed a Bill here, which, if it receives cooperation, and a willingness to make it operatable by all people concerned, the

employers and the employees, it will be a satisfactory piece of legislation to administer the labor relations in this province.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt); Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate on this Labor Relations Act of 1950, we should take into account what the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) has said, that the provisions of Bill were four years in the making.

After looking through the Bill I find a great many of its provisions, almost all in fact, are traceable to previous legislation. They are traceable either to the present Act, or the one that preceded it. And it would seem that in those four years the government has learned very little. There islittle difference between this Act and the other Acts on the topic. All criticisms levelled at the previous Acts can also be levelled at this one. As I read through the Bill one of the thingsthat most impressed me was the sloppiness in drafting the Act. Some sections of the Act, as written, do not say what the government wants to say. I was convinced that this Bill was drawn up by the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) and the half-time Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). One or the other.

(Take C follows)

the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) because it only half sets out to protect the workers, and half the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) because of the sections of it which are obviously poorly drawn. Just for example to point out to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) he, at least at one stage, suffers from draftmanship alone, there is one section of the Act which provides there shall be no discrimination against a person for:

> "No employer or employers' organization and no person acting on behalf of an employer or anemployers' organization shall participate in or interfere with the formation or administration of a trade union----"

and etc, etc.; and yet in the very second section of the Act, he tells us:

> "This Act does not apply,
>
> "to any manager or superintendent or any other person who exercises managerial functions----"

Obviously what the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) meant to tell us was that the managerial persons were not subject to the certification provisions of the Act, but certainly the Act does read in such a way that management, as I see this Act, could indulge in all the kindsof things, intimidation and so on, which they wanted to, because by the very terms of the Act they are excluded from the provisions of the Act.

I point that out only asan example of what I think is weak draftsmanship in the Act to begin with.

MR. DALEY: Too bad I did not know of your drafting ability. I might have called you in.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): He might have drafted you.

MR. PARK: If the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) had done that, he might have avoided that particular difficulty, anyway.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DALEY: Why, sure.

MR. PARK: We were told this Bill was a question of trial and error, the trial and error of the past coming out. Well, I think we have still got most of the errors that were in the old Act. I am glad to see one or two things restored. I am glad to see the restoration in this Bill of the Industrial Disputes Inquiry Commissioner to investigate unjust dismissals. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) bringing that back is a thing we can give him credit for, I think it was desirable and necessary. All I hope is that he makes use of it. He had certain rights under the old Code to permit prosecutions but he never made use of that particular power that he had. I hope he makes use of this power that he seeks in this Act and I hope that when there has been a decision by a Commissioner that workers have been unjustly dismissed, and companies will not abide by the decision of the Commissioner, the Crown will undertake to see that its own legislation is enforced. In the past they have not done so, even when this provision was in the Act.

I am glad too to see the antidiscrimination section which appears in this Act. What strikes me as a little strange about it, however, is that we now have made it illegal by this Bill to have discrimination clauses in employment written into union contracts between a firm and a union, but apparently if they are non-union firms, they can indulge in all the discrimination they want to, it is not to apply to that. That is the effect of the inclusion of that section in this Act and not as part of the general Act.

However, having said those one or two things about points for which the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) can take some credit, I think, I must now tell him that the Bill as a whole falls far short of meeting the needs at the present time.

MR. DALEY: In your opinion.

MR. PARK: In my opinion, of course. I am the one who is speaking, it has to be in my opinion.

The purposes of any Code, if I can think right about it, should be as follows:

Firstly, to regognize the right of labor to organize;

Secondly, to facilitate the recognition of a union once it is organized;

Thirdly, to provide for the speedy settlement of potential disputes or existing disputes and to have a sufficiently flexible conciliation service so that the conciliation can enter into any kind of dispute;

Fourthly, to secure for all labor the assurance that its organizations are going to continue to function, to be effective and to be strong into the future.

MR. DALEY: That is all inthe Act.

MR. PARK: This is not done under this Bill--

MR. DALEY: Every bit of it is in there.

MR. PARK: --no matter how much the government may claim it is in there. For instance, there is no effective outlawing of company unions in this Bill.

MR. DALEY: Company dominated.

MR. PARK: Despite the fact it states in the Act "Company dominated unions," there is no basis upon which the Board can order disestablishment of company unions, which is done in other jurisdictions in this country, and I would have hoped the government would have at least in its explorations through the last four years have discovered that much about labor organizations in this country that it was now prepared to say that not only can company unions not come before the Labor Relations Board---and the onus on the trade union to prove their company domination---but that

it would have had effective measures within this Act to provide for the disestablishment of company unions and their discontinuance.

Other sections of the Act deny the rights of collective bargaining, in effect, to certain categories of workers. The action of saying that municipal employees, for example, cannot come before the Labor Relations Board to get certification unless they do so with the consent of the municipality, surely municipal employees as workers are entitled to the same rights as workers in private industry and ought not to be denied it. As a matter of fact, I tink the Civil Service of this province ought to be entitled to the same right, as well as the right of collective bargain ng by agreement.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: We have now this kind of situation which develops out of the kindsof provisions in this Act at the present time: Right here in the city of Toronto we have had a situation develop where, under the old Act, the same sections of the old Act or the same principles of the old Act, where the city of Toronto passed a by-law authorizing or permitting applications under the Labor Code; a union went out and made application under the Labor Code, got itself certified, then, what does the city of Toronto do, subsequent to that, in order to protect the interests of that particular group exclusively, but the city of Toronto withdraws its by-law, so now no one else has the right to go before the Ontario Labor Relations Board to seek the right of certification. That is the situation which prevails in this city at this very moment.

MR. DALEY: You will have a municipal council that will have to go before the people on that.

MR. PARK: Surely, Mr. Speaker, every time there is a question of a certification, it has not got to go to the general electorate of a municipality? Surely that is not now the alter-

native the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is offering to us in this situation? Surely municipal employees are entitled as a matter of principle to the same rights as workers enjoy in industry generally.

I am not going to go into the arguments we had a year ago about policemen, firemen, teachers and the like of that, but I think they too as workers are entitled to the same rights as other workers in private industry. For the world of me I cannot see why we now have a special provision in an Act about guards, the nature of which is, to all intents and purposes, to exclude them from collective bargaining. The hon.Minister (Mr Daley) may say "No," but the fact of the matter is that it prevents them from association with any of the organized labor movement in this country, and, in effect, precludes them from the service, from the strength that their associationwith the organized labor movement can give. There is no good reason, in my mind, that night watchman and other such guards should be denied the rights of the protection of a collective bargaining contract.

So here you have a situationthat a large number of people, by this Act, are actually precluded from collective bargaining, not assisted in collective bargaining, and there is where the Act falls down, I think, in meeting that first principle that I think a labor code ought to have.

Where those rights are given, they are given in a very restricted way, and they are given in a way that is not practised in any democracy. Thevoting procedures you have set out in that Act if applied to this honorable Legislature, none of us would be sitting here---not one of us. There is not one hon. member returned in the 1948 general election---and I checked the returns to find out---who received the votes of a majority of those eligible to vote in his constituency---not one single hon. member of this House would be sitting here on that basis. And yet the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) says that is the basis which must apply

in votes in collective bargaining in plants. Oh, yes, he has modified it to the extent of saying that people who are absent from the plants that day will not be counted against the union, but he hasleft it in that all those who are at the plant must be counted against the union if they do not vote for the union, that is the principle which is written into this Act and it is a principle which I say is foreign to the most elementary rules and concepts of democracy.

The hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) himself received 13,826 votes out of 47,000 eligible to vote in his constituency. He was a long, long way from 50% of those eligible, and I do not isolate him particularly, the same is true of myself---I got 12,262 out of 40,000, so we are about in the same boat.

AN hon. MEMBER: You are rocking the boat.

MR. PARK: But is quite obvious that if you apply the rules which the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) calls democratic, if you apply the rules whch he now asks to be applied to industrial relations to our political relations, the hon. members of this House simply would have no right to sit here at all.

The principle which I suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) shou d prevail is the principle of a majority vote of the plant, of the workers voting in the election, the same rules that we have about our own election.

There have been some suggestions made and there have been acceptances, the principle has been accepted in other provinces, and certainly I cannot see why we in our labor code cannot go as far, say, as the Nova Scotia Legislature went, where they simply established that a simple majority of 60% of those eligible establishes the right of the union to bargain. In Saskatchewan it is a simple majority, a majority of those eligible to vote and the ones that are entitled, that is the basis upon which a decision is made as to a collective bargaining agency.

This is not something that is so new in theprovince of Ontario, we are not departing in any great way in principle from provisions we have in other Acts. I notice the Farm Marketing Act, for example, has a provision set out in section four of the Farm Marketing Act 1946, which goes on to say:

> "Where the Board receives from any group of persons engaged in the marketing of any farm product a petition or request asking that any scheme for the marketing or regulation of such farm product, including the establishment of a local board, be adopted, the Board may, if it is of opinion that such group of persons is fairly representative of the persons represented in the phase of marketing represented by such group, recommend the adoption of such scheme---"

There you have the principle in a Farm Products Marketing Act where "fairly representative" groupsof people decide what the procedure shall be, whereas here apparently you are not prepared to accept the suggestion of the labor movement as to the basis upon which these settlements should be made, the basis upon which the determination of whether workers want or do not want a particular union as their bargaining agency should be a majority of those passing their ballots in a vote, provided that a majority of the workers in the bargaining unit do participate in the election.

There is anoth r side to this story, too. What happens is this: It is a form of open ballot when you say that by abstaining fromvoting youvote against the union. It is a very simple matter, then, for a representative of the boss to go around and say: "We cam tell how you vote inthis situation by whether you stay away or not. We donpt want a union in this plant, sothe best way for you to say you are opposed tothe union is to stay away from the ballot box." It is a clear-cut indication that they are opposed to the union. By that provision you have open balloting

in this situation, and that is the kind of thing which happens when you have a provision of this kind.

It is a simple, simple matter and if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) had ever worked in industry, he would know it was a simple matter for the firm to apply this kind of pressure if it is the desire of the company that it be done.

On that one issue alone, the failure of the government to accept the democratic principle of a majority rule, I think this Bill, on that score alone, deserves to be defeated.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) knows this, that on the experience of the past, the beneficiaries of this vote system that he has got now have not been the legitimate trade union movement. I can think of a situation in the city of Toronto, where the Evening Telegram, for example, won their newspaper guild, won the vote and lost the election, simply because of this situation. The beneficiary of that situation was Mr. George McCullagh and his campaign at that stage to prevent his newspapermen from becoming organized in order that they might get a little higher salary.

There the union won the vote but it did not have a majority of those who were eligible---they had a majority of those who voted, and as a consequence---it was a small margin, I will grant you---as a consequence of that, the union was thrown out of court by the Labor Relations Board---as the Board had to do, and I am not criticizing the Board at all---as the Board had to do under the terms of the Code.

And we are continuing that practice in this Bill. I can think of another instance, where the chief beneficiaries of this situation were the Communist Party and the unions they run in Port Colborne, where the workers in the plant voted by a good margin---

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): Sit down.

MR. SALSBERG: The Communist Party has no unions in Port Colborne or anywhere else.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York, West): That is what you say.

MR. PARK: Mr. Speaker, I have seen the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) hanging around labor conventions during my few years, and according to a number of delegates to labor conventions a lot of times before that, too many times to be taken in by that kind of denial.

MR. SALSBERG: Long before you were around, I can assure you.

MR. PARK: And it is a fact, whether the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) likes it or not, Mr. Speaker, that his political party was the chief beneficiary of this kind of voting procedure in the collective bargaining Acts of the province of Ontario in the Port Colborne situation, where the Communist-controlled Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union was defeated at the ballot bythe legitimate trade union movement but where this provision we are now rewriting into this Act was brought to bear to protect the Communist Party's interest in the trade union organization.

MR. MacLEOD: Stop your nonsense.

MR. SALSBERG: You cannot stop his nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PARK: Mr. Speaker, those are the beneficiaries of that kind of procedure, minority groups have become the beneficiaries of it, and I would think that on that experience alone the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) would have come to the conclusion some time during the last four years that he ought to change the Act.

But there are other features which are equally bad in this Bill. One of the worst features, as I see it, is the drawn out conciliation procedure. I am not going to dwell at great length on this, there are other speakers who want to speak on other phases

of the Bill, but the drawn-out conciliation procedure which is provided for in this Act, I suppose is based on that old "cooling-off" process. I would like to say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that is the same cooling-off theory they had about the Taft-Hartley Act that got us into the mess we were in the other day when we had this coal shortage on our hands right here, the same theory of cooling-out processes that led to the enactment of similar provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act. They do not "cool-out," they are good heating up processes, that is what they amount to, and the inflexibility of the conciliation procedures provided in this Bill are such that I am sure theyare going to create a lot more situations which could lead to disputes than they are going to eliminate those situations.

Many employers are today using the conciliation proceedings as a form of delaying action and this Act plays completely into their hands. You have set up a rigid procedure for days of time and so on and so forth that at the minimum it seems to me amounts to 99 days, if everything went smoothly from the time a union male an application to an employer for certification, by the time you have got a Board of Conciliation report down. Now, there will be times when, frankly, I am sure the feelings which will be created in those 99 days will reach to explosive situations and that rigidity in your conciliation proceedings is going to cause disputes, just because you have no way of getting around it whenyou set out as you have set out in this Act.

Under this Act there is a section---I do not know whether the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) intends it to read this way---that if a union does not conclude a collective bargaining agreement within a year, it leaves itself wide open for decertification. You have right now with a much less rigid procedure, Conciliation Boards, I am surewhich take on the average six months, many of them

a great deal more; I can name conciliation boards that have gone one and a half years.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (Hamilton East): Two years.

MR. PARK: The hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Dowling) says he knows some which have gone two years. And yet within a year, under this Act, a union stands to lose its certification if it cannot conclude a collective bargaining agreement---not if it has made a reasonable effort to conclude it, but simply if it does not conclude it.

Surely with a rigid conciliation procedure which does nothing but delay, and delay and delay, then at the end, you are encouraging the employer to delay a year and not to indulge in collective bargaining for the purpose of arriving at a collective bargaining contract. He has good reasons not to do so. He has everything in his favor within this Act to cause him to delay further and further in the matter of collective bargaining negotiations.

There are other sections of the Act, but I can name in passing the decertification section of the Act which ismaintained in this Code, a hangover from the other one. The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) learned very little about that. As a matter of fact, the decertification proceedings in this Act make it very much easier to get decertified than they do to get certified. Let me just give you an example. For instance, for decertification, all that is required is that the employees in a plant shall signify in writing that they do not want the union to bargain for them, but to get certification it is not sufficient that they certify in writing that they want the union to represent them, but they, according to the terms of this Act, to become members of the union---it used to be under the old Code that we had a system whereby workers indicated by authorization cards that they wanted a union to represent them and the Labor Relations Board

was free to accept them. Under this Code that is impossible and we have the situation where it is easier to get decertification than it is to get certification, and we are told this is an Act which represents a gain for labor. That I doubt very much.

Finally, there is of course the lack of union security. Even the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) himself, before anyone had spoken, felt a little uncertain about that point, I am sure, because he felt it necessary to make reference to it himself. He did make the comment that if the majority of workers in a plant voluntarily signed a card asking for the giving of an authorization of a check-off of their union dues, he saw little reason why employers in this country should oppose it. Well, I say to him that I see little reason why he should not have put that much at least inthis Bill and it certainly could be done, and done very easily. This isnothing new. It will be too much to expect this government to break new ground in collective bargaining, but there are four provinces in this country which have already accepted the principle of union security in their collective bargaining legislation, British Columbia, with a coalition government in which Conservatives participate; Nova Scotia with a Liberal government; Alberta with its Social-Credit government; and Saskatchewan, which has a good deal more than the minimum requirements that I am seeking now in its Act, with a C. C. F. government.

Surely on the basis of the experience in thos provinces ---and I do not think there has been any serious consequence as a result of their writing that kind of provision into their labor Code, any serious consequences to the people of that province, I think as a matter of fact it has assisted and aided collective bargaining in those provinces, because it has eliminated from the area of discussion and negotiations a matter which can be dynamite and which can lead to industrial

disputes.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) ought to remember that the very fact that we have a Code at all which provides for any kind of certification of unions came out of the fact there were a great number of strikes on the issue of recognition, therefore we found it necessary to write a Code which said you can get certified if you meet certain provisions. Now I say to you, you have the situation where you will meet a number of strikes on the issue of union security. We hve had some bitter ones right in this province. Take the Fordstrike, for example, a few years ago as an example of the kind of thing I mean. If you want to avoid a repetition of that kind of thing in the future, then obviously the way to do it is to put a provision into this Bill which will provide atleast that minimum of union security. That is little enough to seek at this time. And again, that is not something new that has to be written into legislation for this province. There is a section in the Milk Control Act requiring every producer "so engaged to pay to the association license fees in different amounts and fixing the amouhts of such fees payable" and so on, and "requiring every processor and distributor who receives milk from such producer to deduct the amount of the license fees" and so on and so forth. There is a regular Rand formula proceeding written into that particular Act.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): And passed by this government.

MR. PARK: And passed by this government, as the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) reminds me. I do not see why, if in the building of the farmers' organizations of this province---and certainly I appreciate the inclusion of this kind of provision in the Acts I have mentioned---if in building the farmers' organizations of this province it was deemed necessary to write those kind of provisions in, I do not

see why the government should not be prepared to concede at least that much to the building of labor organizations in this province.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, this Bill fails to meet the needs of our modern industrial age. It restricts the right of workers to join trade unions, and where it does admit of those rights, the right of workers to the protection of a union, it provides a certification procedure which is foreign to the most elementary concepts of democracy. The delays in conciliation proceedings set out by the Bill, together with the lack of flexibility in applying conciliation to disputes, is bound to aggravate rather than lessen the likelihood of industrial disputes.

This Bill is worse than the notorious Taft-Hartley Act in the United States in its failure to provide for atleast a minimum of union security. On every one of the major principles upon which a good labor code should be built, this Bill sells those principles short, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, we cannot agree that this Bill should go forward to second reading. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Wismer, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "that" and substituting therefor the following:

> "This House declines to assent to the second reading of a Labor Relations Bill that violates sound principles of labor relations by denying the application of fundamental democratic practices in voting procedures, and in establishing complicated and inflexible conciliation machinery that is likely to create industrial unrest and by ignoring the principle of union security."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Take D follows)

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, one of the first things that this House must take note of when discussing the principles of a Bill is the violation of the principle of the committee system of parliament. The fact is that by bringing in this Bill for second reading without referring it to the Committee on Labour the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) and the government are violating what is an unwritten law of the functions of committees of the House. It is, in fact, an affront to Labour, and an insult to the trade union movement in this province.

This is legislation of a very serious character; it is not secondary or third-rate legislation; it deals with labour relations in the most industrial province of the country, and the least which can be done is to permit the spokesmen for the organized trade union movement to come and publicly present their views. To deny them that elementary right is to offer an insult to that movement, and to rob the government and this House of opinions which are extremely important in the adoption of legislation of this sort.

You could force through a Bill, If you want a Bill which will meet the minimum requirements for labour -- yes, and for industry -- then we should send this Bill to the Labour Committee, and invite all parties to come and express views and present recommendations which the committee of the House would take into consideration. I think we have violated that principle, and by violating it, we invite an unhealthy discussion, and a discussion which could not be the most fruitful. That is obvious.

I would like to quote from an editorial of a paper not unfriendly to the government, the Globe and Mail. They

are dealing with a Federal problem, and I submit to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and to the hon. ministers on the treasury benches that their national leader is trying to do in the Federal House what they refuse to do in this House, where we have the power. Mr. Drew, in my opinion, very correctly, has been insisting that the committee system be re-instituted in the House of Commons. The Globe and Mail says the following about that question:

> "Members of all parties should join in a demand that the necessary committees be set up and put to work immediately. Full use of the committee system which has fallen into lamentable decay in recent years is the only method by which parliament can do its job."

I suggest that applies to this House, with equal force, as it applies to the House of Commons at Ottawa.

The editorial further says:

> "When it comes to a close study of a specific problem, ten or twenty members sitting around a table with the right to summon anyone they would like to question, are far more efficient than the whole House. This is so obvious and well-recognized, that it should not need to be argued, yet, from the record, it does need to be argued at Ottawa."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, when this government refused for five years to convene the Labour Committee, and now refuses to submit so important a piece of labour legislation to that committee, it is flying in the face of public opinion, and against the best interest of labour legislation.

I said before, Mr. Speaker, that this is a piece of

legislation which affects the well-being of the province. Industrial relations are vital relations. And the labour movement has very strong opinions on this question -- very strong opinions.

As late as January 16th, the question of the Labour Act in this province was up for discussion before the very conservative-minded trade union leaders. I do not mean to imply that they are members of the Conservative Party; I hope not, although I have an idea that some of them may be.

Now, the convention of the Ontario Federation of the Trades and Labour Congress met, Mr. Chairman, here are some of the comments made by very responsible leaders of organized labour, and the people with whom I differ politically, and possibly very profoundly, but I agree with what they have said about the Ontario Labour Relations Act.

Mr. Russell Harvey, who is also a member of the Labour Relations Board, had this to say -- and I am quoting from the report of the Globe and Mail of January 16th:-

"There is a process of softening up and de-vitalizing labour legislation in Ontario."

Those are strong words from a member of the Labour Relations Board.

Further on, at the same meeting, Mr. Harry Simon, an A.F. of L. organizer, is quoted as saying - and I was around there, and listened to the words. And for the information of the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) may I say that I have been around labour conventions for many, many more years before he learned to understand what "unions" meant. He must have associated the word "union" with a certain suit about the time I began going

to labour conventions.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Just where does that get you?

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Simon said:

"And strike action was the only answer to dismissal for union activities."

And the report says:

"He is recommending this step to the unions seeking advice."

It had reached a stage where a man of his position and political view, openly said there is only one alternative left, and that is to go on strike.

He further said:

"As yet, no union has been given permission to prosecute an employer, since the Act came into being."

And a man like John W. Bruce, of the International Plumbers and Steamfitters said:

"Present trade unions have gained their present position by being able to stop a job when required, and the Bill is going to rob the unions of their freedom of action."

Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed by another delegate whom I think is a member of the provincial executive of the Progressive Conservative Party of this province, speaking on the floor of that convention, and speaking, in my opinion, very correctly and strongly against the labour legislation as it existed at that time. I gained the impression from what he said, that the union would have to take matters into their own hands.

These are strong views. Why should not this government

seek the opinions of men of that calibre? You might, Mr. Speaker -- I really do not think you might, but that is the way of addressing you -- but the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) might question my opinion and my motive. He would, of course, be unjustified in doigg so, but often I have felt that if the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) would take my advice more often, he be better regarded, and be less disliked by certain sections of labour, than he is today. But, unfortunately, he does not take my advice. He is very suspicious.

I say, however, he cannot obstruct people of that calibre, people of the political beliefs to which I have referred. Why not ask them to come in -- invite them to come in, and give an opinion. You might say, "If you do that to labour, you would have to do it to industry". That is all very well. Let us do that. What is wrong with that? Let industry come and publicly state its position and objectives.

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): That has been going on now for four years.

MR. SALSBERG: The trouble is that industry has not any voice. Oh well, it has a voice, and a very powerful voice, in the formulation of labour legislation, but it has it behind certain curtains, where the voice is not heard outside, but is reflected in the legislation which is later adopted.

HON. GEO. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Is that the Iron Curtain, Joe (Mr. Salsberg)?

MR. SALSBERG: You have a curtain which is really steel, when you want to use it -- not just an iron curtain.

Apart from all this, Mr. Speaker, and because it goes to the root of the problem, we are either going to have good legislation which will embody the wisdom of the thinking

and experienced people directly involved, or we will not. I am not questioning the ability of those who drafted that Bill. I am sure they are quite able. But if there is a mistaken or wrong formulation here, it easily could be corrected. That is not the big question. I am, at this stage, hammering at the way in which they have approached the question, and have denied to the organized workers their right to come and present their views.

I do not think the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) got this in some back-door meeting. He did not. The spokesmen for organized labour, and for the trade union movement, have asked that they be given this opportunity, which has not been given to them.

Furthermore, because of public statements given by recognized official leaders of the unions, the government spokesmen gave a statement to the press that the Bill will not be rushed, but everyone concerned will have a chance of expressing an opinion. But, Mr. Speaker, they are rushing it -- they are rushing it.

I would move, if I have the right to do so -- which I think I have -- that:

"This Bill do not receive second reading today, but that it be referred to the Committee on Labour for study and for examination."

I would rather see that amendment carried, frankly, than the amendment which has already been made, because it would send it back to the committee, rather than kill the whole thing, because we do need improved labour legislation. There is no question of that need. In fact, the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) and the hon. Minister of Labour

(Mr. Daley) admitted it today, although for four years, the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) has repeated from his place that we have "the best labour legislation in the world". Now, at long last, he recognizes that is not so, but that we need better legislation.

I agree with him, and I agree with the government, and I agree with the spokesmen of labour, that we need better legislation, and I would rather see it referred to the committee, than to see it completely killed, and thereby allowing the old unsatisfactory Bill to remain on the statute books of this province.

I have made my motion, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to continue making a few remarks.

MR. DALEY: Do you not think this is a better Bill than the other one?

MR. SALSBERG: I will have something to say about the Bill, but I think if the Bill is going to Committee -- and I think we are making a terrible mistake in not sending it there, aside from the fact that you are violating the principles of the committee system of the House when you refuse to do that --

MR. FROST: You do think the Bill is an improvement?

MR. SALSBERG: I do not say, that, Mr. hon. Premier (Mr. Frost). Do not put words into my mouth, because --

MR. MacLEOD: It is not an easy mouth to put words into.

MR. SALSBERG: I will send on my amendment, and it will be considered in due time.

If the government will agree to this very sensible and desirable procedure, then I will be quite ready to sit down, and say whatever I have to say about the Bill when it

is in Committee, where I think it should be said. I agree with the suggestion I quoted from the Globe and Mail, but you do not want to listen. I agree with the editorial where it says that ten or fifteen or twenty men sitting around a table in committee stage are better able to discuss the weaknesses as well as some of the improvements the Bill contains, than we are in this whole House.

I say again, if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will agree -- and I appeal to him to agree -- to send this to the Labour committee, then I will sit down, and we will continue this discussion in committee stage. If the government will not agree to this necessary procedure, then I want to say a few things about the Bill itself.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, should we not have the amendment to the amendment read? That is customary, and is following the rules, and then we can have this amendment to the amendment either declared in order or out of order?

MR. ACTING SPEAKER: This is not an amendment to the amendment.

MR. SALSBERG: Then we will re-draft it, so it will be.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I suggest, in its present form, it is not in order.

MR. FROST: It is not in order, as it stands, at all.

MR. SALSBERG: What is not in order?

MR. MacLEOD: We will take care of that.

MR. SALSBERG: There will be an amendment to the amendment, that the Bill be not now read a second time, but be referred to the Committee on Labour, where it will be studied

and examined.

I am sorry to see the government remaining as stubborn in its position, and defiant in its position, in the face of labour's demand for an opportunity to speak about this Bill.

The fact is, this government has now fixed dates upon which they will receive presentations from spokesmen of the majority of organized workers in this province, and I hope the government will agree to wait for this reading until such time as they will have the representatives of trade unions before them, and not insist on ramming it down our throats, and getting it through every possible stage in the House before these people come to them.

I think that is a very unreasonable procedure, and terribly wrong. When you know you are going to meet representatives in a week or so, I say it is terribly wrong to insist on this going through and refusing to send it to the Committee on Labour.

In the Bill itself, there are some things which indicate improvement. One thing, from my reading of it, which is acceptable to everyone, and is certainly an improvement, is the subsection which speaks about the voiding of any contract which discriminates against a worker because of race or creed. I think that is definitely an improvement. That is definitely something new. With that subsection, I want to express my gratification, and appreciation, if you please.

But I cannot say that about many more parts of this Bill.

The hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) has touched on the fundamental weaknesses of the Bill, and I am inclined to agree with many of the things he said. I do not know by what process of reasoning he came to the conclusion that the

people of my political view like the present system. We do not. I will fight as long as possible, and as long as necessary, for the protection of the very simple, democratic majority rule, in voting for certification. When you refuse to include that, you refuse to grant the minimum democratic procedure that is required, that the majority voting should decide, just, as the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) said, as you do in Federal, municipal, and provincial elections.

And the concessions, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister (Mr. Daley) gives in this Bill, which he enlarges and elaborates upon, is not worth a hoot --

MR. DALEY: Do you want it taken out?

MR. SALSBERG: I want the whole Bill thrown back to the Committee, and you are scared to stand up before a committee and defend your legislation.

MR. DALEY: I am defending it right here.

MR. SALSBERG: That is what you are -- you are just scared. The concession that those who are sick and absent and not voting should not be counted against the union is a "terrific concession", but anybody else who is in the plant, but does not vote, is counted as negative to the union. You want that concession? Well, that concession is a special Tory kind. Labour, I assure you will,not appreciate you very much in that.

I wish you would listen to some of the Conservative members in the union, and you would get an ear full. Do not be afraid to go and listen. Invite them here.

In the main, it is true that there is a gulf between what labour wants, and what this Bill contains.

On the matter of the execution, I do not see why several things are included. I do not want to repeat things which

have been said, but why are municipal groups brought into that category, whereby local municipal council must adopt a law before they can enjoy the benefits of collective bargaining? Why should provincial employees be in that position? Is it not too bad, Mr. hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar)? You know to what I am referring. I am conscious of what you are afraid of.

You are leaving out an important category of workers, the agriculture workers. Why? I do not think any hon. member coming from a rural constituency would favour that. There are hundred of men employed in various agricultural areas, such as the tobacco areas, in the canning factories, and so on, and in the fruit belt. Why should these workers be denied the right of collective bargaining? Yes, and why should domestics be denied the right of collective bargaining? I cannot understand it, and I am sure the entire labour movement will refuse to accept that.

There are a number of other things which might be elaborated upon, in addition to what the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) said, but let me deal with one problem here -- and I am not proposing an amendment, because it is not so easy. I think it requires careful consideration. I see you have a number of places marked out and incorporated in this Bill which amount to the denial of the right to strike, and justifies the complaint that trade union leaders had at the convention of the Ontario Federation, from the report of which I quoted before, that they will "lose their freedom of action," as Mr. Bruce has stated. You would punish the unions for what you call "wild-cat strikes". There is the process of conciliation, then compulsory arbitration, and then you would

punish them, and not only them, but their international or national unions --

MR. FROST: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I suppose the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is referring to subsection 2 of section 59. If that is the interpretation which he places on it -- which I can assure him is wrong, and was never intended -- may I say that that subsection is out anyway, and, therefore, does not apply.

MR. SALSBERG: I am aware of the statement by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), but even with the exclusion of that section, there are situations arising where a rigidly applied set of laws as contained in the Bill could punish workers unduly and unjustifiably. I want to give one example, Mr. Speaker, but I want to preface my remark with this: that I am opposed to "wild-cat strikes", as I am sure we all are. "Wild-cat strikes" are dangerous things, and the workers know it.

But occasions arise in factories where employers -- especially if they know in advance that they have the protection of the law -- will refuse to discharge the issues and complaints which are before them, and allow an accumulation of grievances, to a point where the workers, in desperation, will just walk off their jobs.

I do not know the details, and I am not presuming to speak for the Auto Workers in Oshawa, but I think what happened in that strike, which you would label a "wild-cat strike" was the expression of the cumulative effect of the attitude of management which permitted the accumulation of complaints and grievances, and refused to settle them, practically for weeks and months, in the meantime, introducing

a speeding-up system of production, which made these workers feel they have nothing to lose, and they become nervous and irritable, and so on, with the result that they walked off their jobs. Nobody desires that. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the hon. members of this House, that with such protective legislation brought in, too many employers and their representatives would do nothing to settle the issues, knowing the men cannot stop work without losing their rights.

There are many other items. But I want to conclude now, because there will be an opportunity, I hope, to discuss this thing in committee stage. You see, I have not yet given up hope. I do not mean the committee stage when the House is in Committee of the Whole, I mean in the Labour Committee. I hope the government will reconsider. It would not be a sign of weakness on their part to agree now, at this hour, to send the Bill to the Committee on Labour. On the contrary, it will be a sign of the desire of the government to get the best possible legislation, and do it in the most democratic fashion, where all sides will have a chance to come and present their points of view.

If I thought that was entirely ruled out now, I would perhaps continue to speak, and elaborate on other points.

This is not minor legislation. It is important legislation. And I do hope that the government will, shall I say, "bethink" themselves and allow this to go to the Committee on Labour, and I would say to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) who still enjoys, and I hope will continue to enjoy, and certainly up until now has enjoyed, the good feeling from all parties of the Opposition group, that he should do

what he says he does from time to time when in doubt. He told this House, a year or so ago, "When in doubt, I sit down and turn to old man Ontario, and I say, 'Now, old man Ontario, how would you like this? What do you think about this?' and old man Ontario, with a straw in his mouth, hesitates, and rocks for a minute or two in the rocker on the veranda, and then turns to me and says, 'Well, my boy, I think you should change your mind.' "

(Take E follows)

And when Old Man Ont rio says that, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) changed his mind without any hesitation. I would say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), "Just turn your ear to Old Man Ontario."

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Are you Old Man Ontario?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSB RG: I think I hear the voice of Old Man Ontario. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should do th t and should say to Old Man Ontario, "Now, look, we are introducing in legislation dealing with immensely profound problems, and issues, labor management rel tions in our industrial province, serious differences of opinion. We want legialation that will meet the requirements and the needsof t is province. We have not had a chance to get the spokesmen for organized labor to appear and give their point of view. Do you think it would be correct on my part as Prime Minister to send this Bill to the Committee on Labor so as to give them a chance?" Old Man Ontario would take thestraw out of his mouth in a hurry and would say: "Of course, of course, send it to the Committee on Labor, give everyone a chance to go there, let collective wisdom be polled". I assure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) those are the words Old Man Ontario would use and I am hopeful that his reply would be the kind that I am sure he would be prepared to give if only he also heard the words and the voice of Old Man Ontario.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the---

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I was going to suggest this to the hon. member (Mr. Oliver). There are a number who desire to speak on this Bill and if it would suit the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) he might adj urn the debate on this matter at the present time and we could go into committee

on a number of matters. There is no possibility of completing the debate on this Bill tonight.

MR. OLIVER: I will be glad to agree to that. Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to,

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee, Mr. Patrick in the chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 35.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 35th order, House in Committee on Bill number 80, "An Act to amend the Separate Schools Act," Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

Bill number 80 reported.

HON. L SLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 36.

TEACHING PROFESSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 36th order, House in Committee on Bill number 81, "An Act to amend the Teaching Profession Act, 1944," Mr. Porter.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) isit compulsory all teachers belong to this Federation? There is no option in the matter?

MR. PORTER: No option at all.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Union security.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York, West): Mr. Chairman, before we go to section 3, the Bill in the two sections provides for these associated members of the Ontario Teachers' Federation.

In the Bill for the Ontario Teachers' Federation we have a compulsory check-off or union security system. I notice the regulations are to be made by the governors or board of governors of the Federation itself. What is being done to either protect or include these associte members regarding their fees to the Federation?

MR. PORTER: Oh, well, I am informed they are not to be asked to pay fees. It is not the policy of the Federation, so the members will not be asked to contribute fees. The main purpose of this, as I explained on either the first or second reading, I forget which, the main purpose of this was to include the students in the Teachers' Training Schools because many of them actually do teach under contracts before they are finally qualified, they take temporary jobs, and in many cases the Teachers of Federation think they should have protection and some of the responsibilities attached to members of the profession while they are doing that, and that is the object of this.

I am informed there is no suggestion they will be charged fees for associate membership.

MR. MILLARD: That was the very point I was covering. If they are going to be actually teaching, then it seems to me they are working for boards and receiving salaries, they should be responsible for their share of the Federation while they are teaching. The second question which comes to my mind is what rights and privileges and what reasons for their being in the Federation, and will they be afforded the rights and participate in it if they are not dues-paying members?

MR. PORTER: The intention is they will be accorded the privilege as the hon. member (Mr. Millard) will see. This applies to students at the Normal Schools. It is quite obvious they are not going to be there for very long, and I believe it does happen at some time while they are still students they do take on

temporary teaching contracts to fill in here and there. There have been cases where certain difficulties have arisen and if they had the protection of the Federation, for what it is worth, they would have the same protection as anybody else under a teaching contract. That is the proposition.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to labour this point with the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), but the Teachers' Federation with the exception of those who checked out in the early stages of the Act, are all compulsory members of the Federation. Now, it provides for a system of voluntary membership. I just want to know, in subsection (bb) of section two, where it says:

> "Providing for voluntary membership in the Federation of persons who are not members thereof and prescribing the duties, responsibilities and privileges of voluntary members".

You are going to have two classes of members, one voluntary, and the other compulsory. I am just wondering if these teachers go out and teach for two or three years before they get their final certificate, which has been done in many cases, and which I think is contemplated in the interim report of the Hope Commission, that that can very well be done again.

What are you going to have them do then, if they come into the organization or --

MR. PORTER: The voluntary members, of course, are entirely different from the associate members. The Teachers' Federation wants to have provision made so they can take in voluntary members who would not be compelled to be members

as paying members of the teaching profession, active members of the teaching profession. They no doubt have in mind, they might be retired teachers, or others who are not compelled to be members under the Act, because they are active in the teaching profession, but they may have substantial interest in the teaching profession and may desire voluntary membership and attend whatever meetings there are, and have something to say about the profession, and they can be admitted. That is what they want, as I understand it, and I do not think there is anything very unreasonable about that.

MR. MILLARD: I suppose they might even give the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) an honorary membership?

MR. PORTER: That is something they might do if they are satisfied with what we have done for them.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): In Clause 3 of section one, there is no doubt about it, it says:

> "Every student in a Normal School or in the Ontario College of Education shall be an associate member of the Federation."

It does not say "may be".

MR. PORTER: Those are the associate members, which are quite different from the voluntary members.

Section 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, before the Act is passed, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), this Bill gives the Teachers' Federation additional power inside their profession, and I think we all agree with that idea, but I am wondering if they are in some

cases, or if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is not in some cases failing to use his right as an hon. Minister to hear teachers who have made application through their association for a Board of Reference, or not being granted an opportunity to bring their problems before their profession, and they ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) for a Board of Reference.

I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is not leaving more authority in the hands of the profession than he should, when he refused any teacher a Board of Reference. Now, I understand in answer to a question of the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) on the first of March, there were 21 applications from public school teachers in the last ten years for a Board of Reference, and eight were refused; there were 16 applications from secondary school teachers, and three were refused; there were three applications from technical school teachers, and the whole three were refused. It seems to me when a teacher is refused a Board of Reference, she goes to her local M.P.P. --

MR. PORTER: Has anybody brought them to you?

MR. DENNISON: Yes.

MR. PORTER: You never told me about it.

MR. DENNISON: I did not, and I am asking now if your office is going to handle these complaints if we bring them to your Department?

MR. PORTER: As I have told you a dozen times in this House, if anyone thinks there is someone not getting fair treatment, to come to me. It is astonishing to hear the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) speak on this Bill, on something that has nothing to do with it at all, something to do with a Board of Reference under a different section entirely.

If there is someone not getting a fair deal, he is a constituent of mine, but he does not come to me, but brings it in on this Bill. It is astonishing to me and quite irrelevant.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, I object to those remarks, this is not irrelevant, absolutely not irrelevant for this reason, we are asked by the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) to give a number of additional powers, and I am drawing to his attention the fact that the powers we have already given to them are not satisfying the objects of members of their profession. They are not granted a Board of Reference, and when they appeal to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), nothing is done.

MR. PORTER: No, no.

MR. DENNISON: Boards of Reference have been refused.

MR. PORTER: Well, I know, but --

MR. DENNISON: I hope you will not refuse this one.

MR. PORTER: If you give me any case where there is unjust refusal, let me know of it. You have been harbouring some case in your breast, and you are in my own constituency, and you would not bring her up to see me. You are afraid she might be convinced she was voting the wrong way.

Section 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 81 reported.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I move we revert to Order 35. In this, there was one very slight amendment that was required, which was drawn to my attention and I had no note of it here. I should have mentioned it at the time. It is an amendment to section one of Bill No. 80:

"The Separate Schools Act is amended by adding thereto the following section:

Every treasurer and collector and, if the Board so requires, every other officer of the Board shall give security for the faithful performance of his duties, and the security shall be deposited with the clerk of the municipality."

Strike out the words, "with the clerk of the municipality", and insert, "for safe-keeping as directed by the Board".

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): I did not think this government took any backward steps. You are going back on us now.

MR. PORTER: This is a forward step.

MR. TAYLOR: But you are going back to do it.

MR. PORTER: I move, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that Section one be amended accordingly.

Section one, as amended, agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 37.

POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 37th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 83, "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act", Mr. Challies.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On Section 3.

MR. W. DENNNSON (St. David): On Section 3, Mr. Chairman, in the third last line, we see,

"notwithstanding anything in or done pursuant to any other Act".

Then, we go on to say,

> "used for, or adapted or useful for, or capable of being used or made useful for generating, transforming, transmitting, distributing,or selling electric or other power or energy".

I wonder if the Hydro should be entirely free from responsibility imposed upon it by other Acts of this Legislature. Now, I have in mind Acts under the Planning and Development, very necessary restrictions in regard to the proper planning. I have in mind the removal of trees from flooded lands. The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) at the present time asks the Hydro to cut down the trees, burn them and remove them before the land is flooded. If this particular section is passed, I do not think the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) will have the power to require the Hydro to be moved by any other Acts of the province, and I think it is probably asking too much to ask the Hydro to be a complete agency to itself, and not be required to conform to other legislation.

Hon. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): This has nothing to do with flooded lands. The fact is, before a lease is given to the Commission by the Crown, there is always an arrangements made as regards flooding of the land, and this does not come within that at all. This is just a question of whether there may be a road or some other works in connection with the power development, where there may be some minor restriction put on the land, and the Commission feel that the Commission should have the right to go into that without any trouble. As far as flooded lands are concerned, that is a

serious problem, but this has nothing to do with it.

MR. MILLARD: I wonder if I might revert back to clause 3 of section 2 for a moment. It has to do with the Hydro report, and it says:

> "The Provincial Secretary shall submit the report to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and shall then lay the report before the Assembly if it is then in Session, or if not, at the next ensuing Session."

Now, we just received the Hydro report, sent to us a short time ago for 1948. In other words, it was long, long past due. It seems to me when we get a report on Hydro, it is so out of date, that it is not of much use when seeking to find the position of Hydro at that particular time. I was just wondering if some way might be provided by way of the report?

MR. CHALLIES: As soon as it is ready it could be given to the hon. members. The point is, if the report comes in a week after the House adjourns, it has to wait another year, and this provides that the annual report can be filed with the hon. Provincial Secretary as soon as the report is ready. As it is now, the whole system is complicated. We have a fiscal year in Hydro, we have a calendar year with the municipalities, and a government fiscal year, with the result that data that is furnished, questions that are asked, may have two sets of answers, both correct, but there is no conformity as regards a year.

This will correct that, and it will provide when the annual report is ready, it can be filed, the same as the other Government Departments with the hon. Provincial

Secretary, and then they will be made available.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Under Section 3, I just want to ask a question. Prior to this amended section coming into effect, would any other Act of the Legislature bring a municipality -- for instance, one where it might be necessary to have property for distributing projects, are you changing anything there?

MR. CHALLIES: No, the whole change in the Act is, notwithstanding anything to do be done under any other Act.

MR. WISMER: No, I asked the question, if we pass this section and the Hydro had some such desire to place a transforming station or a large distributing project in the center of some area which would interfere with the Planning and Development, what way is there for stopping it?

MR. CHALLIES: There is none, no way of stopping it.

MR. WISMER: Do you not think there should be?

MR. PORTER: Do you not realize the Hydro is preeminent?

MR. WISMER: Do you not think the Legislature should have that? It seems to me we might give the Hydro the right to do this, notwithstanding any other Act, providing they had the authority of the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies)

MR. CHALLIES: I do not quite get the point. The only purpose is, you may get in conflict with somebody with a subdivision of land, and a project has been put there, and someone comes along and you cannot use the land, which you already have. It occurs in connection with the question of distribution of our transmission lines.

MR. DENNISON: Has the lack of this held the Hydro up to your knowledge?

MR. CHALLIES: Not to my knowledge. We do not anticipate trouble, but it was felt by the solicitors that the Commission

would be protected to a greater extent if that clause was put in.

MR. WISMER: Mr. Chairman, before we pass this, I am not in favour of handicapping the Hydro; I think the Hydro has done a very fine job, but there are many people in the Province of Ontario, throughout the years, who feel that sometimes the Hydro may have elbowed its way in.

MR. MacLEOD: There was the Griffiths case.

MR. WISMER: There should be some way of going about it, to keep at least some checks and balances as between a great public corporation, other public corporations and the owners of property. It seems to me this gives a great deal of latitude, the sort of latitude I would object to if it were a private corporation. I would certainly object to it if you gave this to a private power corporation, and, as reasonably, I think I should object to this being given to the Hydro Corporation. I think there should be some way in which the government of Ontario might be able to refer a dispute as between whether the Hydro should increase its holdings in the Town of Leaside, say, or in some municipality around Ontario, where we are bringing in large amounts of power through generating stations, and it appears to me -- I only say it appears -- if we pass this there is not much we can do.

MR. CHALLIES: The Commission has the right to expropriate property for that purpose, but in this clause, it states, "that whereas the application of the Commission for authority has been passed upon by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and authorized --- ". It is required to be checked there. An impossible situation would arise if the work were interfered with, by some other Act. Now, I do not anticipate

(Take F-1 follows)

anything would be done in connection with any other Act. It has to proceed with the issue of an Order-in-Council before the work starts. Once the transmission lines are started through an area, the hon. member (Mr. Wismer) will appreciate the fact that it is one of the most difficult and trying problems Hydro has to contend with, that is, the erection of towers through valuable land. I think it was only two or three years ago when we re-classified the value the property department could give the land, depending on the state of cultivation, or proximity to a municipality. When you get a transmission line, which will cost perhaps as high as $60,000. per mile, you cannot twist it in and out, from an engineering point of view.

The hon. member (Mr. Wismer) mentioned one from up north, where there was some difficulty, but that was not being done by the Hydro itself; it was a contractor working for the Hydro, although I assume the Hydro will have to take responsibility for their actions. But our enginnering and property department have definite instructions that they must not enter any private property without first interviewing the owner, explaining the reason why, and trying to make an amicable settlement, before going on the property.

Knowing the situation, as I do know it, with the number of lines coming in, we have very, very few settlements which have to be made by arbitration. There is generally a settlement made between the commission and the owner of the property, and it is desirable the commission make its settlements as liberal as we can. With the thought in mind that you are taking property from an individual for the benefit of the whole, you have to be as generous as you possibly can under the existing circumstances.

MR. WISMER: I agree with the hon. minister (Mr. Challies), but I have one final thought. Considering if we pass this section, and the Hydro decides in order to generate the power, it is necessary to bring it into a big area like Toronto, and if certain types of heavy equipment must be placed in a large area, by passing this legislation, once it receives the permission from the Order-in-Council to proceed with the development, it would appear to me we have set aside all the provisions of the Planning Act and similar Acts. I admit you cannot set them aside by Order-in-Council, but the Legislature will set aside those Acts, by its action, in passing this legislation and I am wondering if that is a good thing to do.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) referred to the section which has to do with the fiscal year. Some years ago the Hydro and the province had the same fiscal year, which ended on the 31st of October. Then the province changed its fiscal to end of the 31st of March. Now the Commission comes along and changes its fiscal year to coincide with the calendar year. If you are going to change it, why not have it coincide with the provincial fiscal year?

MR. CHALLIES: It was felt by the Commission that we have more in common with the years of the municipalities, as we are dealing with municipalities, more so than we have with the government, in connection with their fiscal year. The accounts of the municipalities then would be uniform, which is the end of the regular calendar year.

I will give you an example of the difficulty. If you were to ask what the peak load for energy was in the year

1949, that would be last year. My answer then would be, made in March, 1950, that the peak load was in December, 1948. There is no rhyme or reason for it. We speak of the years which the people are accustomed to understand.

MR. NIXON: Yes, but when we ask you how much money you owe the province of Ontario, or how many of your bond issues the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has put his name to as guarantor for the year 1949, then the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) will have to explain that your fiscal year does not coincide with theirs, and there could be much great difference.

MR. CHALLIES: As the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) knows, if they guarantee bonds for the Hydro, and you ask them what the guarantee of the government is for the fiscal year, 1950, that means in the months from April 1st, 1949, to March 31st, 1950.

MR. NIXON: But the years do not coincide. I do not agree with you when you say you have hot as much in common with the government as with the municipalities.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex, North): Would that eliminate the thirteenth power bill?

MR. CHALLIES: I think there is some misunderstanding about that, as it was mentioned in the House recently. The thirteenth bill is for this reason; if the municipalities are buying power, we cannot tell what the power bill will be until the end of the year 1950,, so we issue an interim bill based on a rate fixed at the beginning of each and every year, which is higher than the actual cost, and when the year is over, and the cost of power to the municipality is determined, they get a debit or a credit on the 13th bill.

It is interesting to know that as far as 1949, ending on the 31st of October 1949, and starting in 1948, there were 23 municipalities in the province of Ontario who had a credit totalling over $2½ million.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): You would not say it will be that way next year?

MR. CHALLIES: The interim bill has been raised, and they will be billed under the new rate.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, before we get away from section 3, I think I should say that those who travelled throughout the province a good deal have heard a good many complaints. I am not saying I take all the complaints seriously, and in many cases I think they have been straightened out after the complainant wrote to Mr. Saunders, or something of that sort. But what has impressed me is the fact that the Hydro public relations are not all they might be. I am not referring to the speeches on the radio, or the advertisements; I am referring to the Hydro's relations with the citizens throughout the province.

I am not montioning these things really by way of criticism, but just to make it clear that I think the Commission should always be on its guard against the tendency, or the temptation of some people to be a bit arbitrary. That applies to Hydro crews, sometimes, and it also applies to engineers at another level.

The hon. minister (Mr. Challies) says that strict instructions are given that property owners shall always be interviewed before the crews go onto the property. Maybe that is not always possible. I know they are going on private property without interviewing anybody, and sometimes they have

to. I do not object to that, but I think it is elementary to see the owner before anything of that kind is undertaken, and usually it is a very simple procedure, and I think that usually the Hydro will get the cooperation of the owners -- in some cases, anyway.

MR. CHALLIES: It is a little difficult, because sometimes they call and the owner is out, but the instructions are given that not even a preliminary survey crew shall enter a property without seeing the owner.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not saying the instructions are not there, but they should be enforced.

Coming again to the more senior people, the enginners; the most important thing about an engineer is that he is an engineer, and the better the engineer, the greater the temptation to overlook other considerations which might not seem to matter much from an engineering point of view, but are matters greatly in the public interest.

As I think the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) knows, there have been some arguments -- some pretty heated arguments -- about certain transmission lines, and the location of those lines. I am not passing judgment on them, but there was one case which I think the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) knows, where half the county came down here before the matter was settled, when it was proposed to run a line through a valuable woods in a certain way. That took a lot of settling.

Those of us who are interested in the welfare of Hydro are particularly anxious that the good name of the Commission should not be prejudiced by any indiscretion which can be avoided.

I think it also has to be recognized -- certainly from

a service point of view -- that the engineer does not always see all the factors which enter into the problem. There may be considerations which are of high importance to the Department of Lands and Forests; there may be considerations which are of high importance to some other department, and those considerations may mean nothing to an engineer. I am not criticizing the engineers, but they do not always have the widest view, and there should be a very careful check on some of their activities.

MR. WISMER: Mr. Chairman, before we pass section 3, I would like to draw attention to a matter in this regard. I do not want to raise the Toronto issue again --

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member (Mr. Wismer) if he will agree to leave section 3 stand over, and we can proceed with the other items, and can get more particulars later on section 3.

MR. WISMER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Section 3 stands.

On Section 4.

MR. WM. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, on section 4, on the second page from the page on which the section starts, subsection 10; this apparently is a new principle, that a municipality may, on the vote of the electors concerned, dis-establish its Hydro Commission, and operate the hydro itself. I wonder if the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) will tell us if that is done in any case, or has there been any demand for this? It seems to be me to be rather a dangerous principle, and I noticed in the Hydro Bill --

MR. CHALLIES: The question is in regard to the voting area in a township. As the law is now, the voting area

is set aside for contracts for power in the township. The question is, who has a vote in that area? As the law is now, everybody in the township votes. This provides that only those in the area shall vote as to whether they want the township to enter into an agreement.

MR. DENNISON: I think you are on the wrong section.

MR. CHALLIES: That is part of the amendment -- section 10; there is no change there. As far as subsection 10 is concerned, these are in an area in part of the township of Brantford, and there had to be some machinery set up, and that is the machinery. There is no change in it. Part of the township commission would be taken over by the city of Brantford, and there is always a credit there for what is sold.

MR. NIXON: There is no township of Brant; I never heard of it.

MR. CHALLIES: No, I said, a township outside of Brantford, whatever it is.

MR. DENNISON: This section deals with after you have a Hydro Commission in an area, then subsection 10 is a method by which you can dis-establish that, and it seems to me that would apply to the whole area, and it might be possible for a city such as Oshawa, we will say, to disband, its local Hydro Commission and take over the job of running the Hydro as a department of municipal government. If the hon. minister (Mr. Challies) might make that clear, if that is the intention of the section --

MR. CHALLIES: Section 54 of the Power Commission Act refers only to the areas in townships.

Section 4 agreed to.

On Section 5.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, on

section 5, where it says, "The Commission shall contract with the Power Transmission Company for the use of its right of way and property for all purposes of the Commission", I do not want to put the hon. vice-chairman of Hydro (Mr. Challies) on the proverbial "spot", and I will not press for an answer if he does not want to give to me. I wonder if the Hydro has any idea in mind, in connection with the Niagara Tunnel, in taking over the Canadian Niagara Power Company.

MR. CHALLIES: I would not be able to answer that at the resent time. As the Act is now, each and every extension of a rural line in a township across a railway has to be approved by Order-in-Council. That means you are at times held up for orders-in-council. When rural Hydro was only in its initial stages, and when it was very easy to get an order-in-council passed approving of the extension over a railroad right of way, it was a comparatively simple matter.

I cannot answer the hon. member's (Mr. Houck) question at this time.

Sections 5 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise and report two Bills, one with amendment, one without amendment, and one Bill to be held over for further consideration.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report one Bill with amendment, one Bill without amendment, and one Bill held over, and moves the adoption of the report.

Report agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. We will proceed with the addresses on the Speech from the Throne tomorrow.

MR. NIXON: Not at two o'clock?

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): No, make it three o'clock.

MR. FROST: Yes, at three o'clock. The addresses on the Speech from the Throne will continue tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.0 p.m.

/ / / / / /

- - - - - -